DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 025 889 40 EC 003 483

By-Williams, Charles F.; Johnson, George H.
A Pilot Evaluation of Instructional Material Centers. Final Report.
American Institutes for Research, Washington, D.C.
Spons Agency-Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C. Bureau of Education for the Handicapped.
Bureau No-BR-7-0438
Pub Date Jan 68
Grant-OEG-2-7-070438-3027
Note-145p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.75 HC-$7.35
Descriptors-Demonstrations (Educational), Evaluation Methods, *Exceptional Child Research, Information Centers, Information Dissemination, Information Retrieval, Information Services, Inservice Teacher Education, Institutes (Training Programs), *Instructional Materials Centers, Libraries, Library Services, Material Development, *Program Evaluation, Publications, Surveys

A 9-month pilot evaluation of the developing Special Education Instructional Materials Center (SEIMC) Network utilized two approaches: a process evaluation with site visits to determine the status of activities at the SEIMC's at the universities of Wisconsin and Southern California; and a user survey of 588 mail questionnaires, follow-up interviews with 175 teachers, and interviews with 44 administrators. There were few differences between regions on major issues. Of the teachers and administrators in both regions, 90% were aware of the SEIMC's, and over half were familiar with the service programs. One-fourth of the teachers had visited a SEIMC library. Of the SEIMC's resources and staff time, 90% went to service functions (40% library, 10% evaluation). Both centers had become primary interfaces between the federal Bureau of the Handicapped, state divisions, local school districts, and university programs in special education. The primary communication link was publications, with Wisconsin's 1,700 circulation and California's 7,000. Teachers considered materials demonstrations at their meetings the most valuable service (centers averaged three a month); but the study found the five inservice training institutes by Wisconsin and California's several conferences most valuable. (Author/SN)

BR-7-0438
OE-BR

PA 40

ED025889

FINAL REPORT
Project No. 7-0438
Grant No. OEG-2-7-070438-3027

A PILOT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL CENTERS

January 1968
(Revised, August 1968)

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Division of Research

EC003458

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

FINAL REPORT

Project No. 7-0438
Grant No. OEG-2-7-070438-3027

A PILOT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL CENTERS

by

Charles F. Williams
George H. Johnson

Revised and Edited by

Patricia H. Smyke
Jacques H. Robinson

American Institutes for Research
Washington, D. C.

January 1968
(Revised, August 1968)

The research reported herein was performed pursuant to a grant with the Office of Education, U. S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. Contractors undertaking such projects under Government sponsorship are encouraged to express freely their professional judgment in the conduct of the project. Points of view or opinions stated do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF
HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

Office of Education
Bureau of Education for the Handicapped
Division of Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

List of Tables iv

SUMMARY 1

INTRODUCTION 7

PART I - PROCESS EVALUATION

ACTIVITIES AND STATUS OF THE SEIMCs 11

- Identification of Goals and Objectives 12

ACTIVITIES RELATED TO ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES 16

- Service Function Activities 16
- Activities in the Development of Evaluation Methodology 18
- Development of Instructional Materials 18
- Percentage of Effort Related to Activities 19

PERFORMANCE DATA ON THE OPERATION, IMPLEMENTATION, AND ADMINISTRATION OF PROGRAMMED ACTIVITIES 21

- Acquisition of Documents, Materials, and Educational Devices 21
- Usage of Library Materials 22
- Information Retrieval Services 23
- Publications 24
- Demonstrations, Displays and Conferences 25
- Relationships with State Agencies 27
- Development of Associate and Satellite Centers 29
- Consultive Services 30
- Relationships with Graduate Programs 31
- Evaluation of Materials 32
- Stimulating the Development of Instructional Materials 33
- Other Activities 34
- Conclusion, Part I 35

PART II - USER SURVEY

Page

OBJECTIVES OF THE SURVEY 37

METHODOLOGY OF THE SURVEY 38

SURVEY FINDINGS

- Mail Questionnaire to Special Education Teachers 44
  - Characteristics of the Respondents 45
  - Knowledge and Use of SEIMC Services 49
  - Evaluation of Present Materials and Resources 54
  - Differences between Wisconsin and California 63
- Interviews with Special Education Teachers 65
  - Interviews with Non-Respondents 70
- Interviews with Special Education Administrators 72

APPENDICES

- Appendix A - Tables (Total Response) 78
- Appendix B - Tables (California and Wisconsin Responses Separated) 97
- Appendix C - Survey Techniques 120
- Appendix D - Samples of Survey Booklets and Cover Letters 126

LIST OF TABLES

PART II - USER SURVEY

Table		Page
1	Interviews with Special Education teachers	41
2	Summary of returns to mail survey	44
14	Extent to which school budget allows teacher to purchase regular classroom materials	48
15	Extent to which school budget allows teacher to purchase supplementary materials	48
18	Source of information about the SEIMC	49
20	Main reasons for not using library resources	50
29	Respondent's evaluation of effect of IMC on Special Education at the local level	52
31	Most needed improvements in service and effectiveness of the IMC	53
34	Teacher evaluation of materials now in use	57
35	Present method of evaluating Special Education materials in respondent's school system	58
37	Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	59
38	Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	59
41	Services which would be most beneficial to Special Education teachers	61

NOTE: Only those tables appearing in the body of the report are listed above. Additional tables, not listed above, will be found in Appendix A and Appendix B.

SUMMARY

This report presents the findings of a nine-month pilot evaluation of the Special Education Instructional Materials Centers Network conducted by the American Institutes for Research. Two prototype centers were studied--the SEIMC at the University of Wisconsin and the IMCSE at the University of Southern California at Los Angeles.

Two evaluation methods were employed in this study: (1) a process evaluation, providing information on the status of activities at the two Centers; and (2) a user survey to collect information on the current needs and practices of Special Education personnel and to measure the impact of the SEIMCs on Special Education in the California and Wisconsin regions.

The user survey had three parts: (1) a mail questionnaire sent to Special Education teachers in the areas served by the California and Wisconsin SEIMCs, (2) follow-up interviews with 175 of these teachers, and (3) interviews with 44 Special Education administrators.

A four page survey booklet containing 39 questions (115 response variables) was mailed to 1, 792 Special Education teachers. Five hundred and eighty-eight (588) teachers returned the questionnaire, representing a 33. 5% return. The Wisconsin sample yielded a 45% return rate as compared with a 25% return from the California mail-out. A large proportion of the respondents (especially in Wisconsin) were teachers of the mentally retarded, and not all specialties in the field of Special Education were proportionately represented.

The information collected in the interviews tended to parallel the findings of the mail survey. In addition, interviews with non-respondents yielded results very similar to the data obtained from mail questionnaire respondents.

Few differences were found between the two regions on the major variables in this study, suggesting that the basic issues in Special Education do not differ radically from one region to another.

The primary objective of the Special Education Instructional Materials Center Network is to provide Special Educators and allied personnel with ready access to valid instructional materials and information related to the education of handicapped children. This objective is to be accomplished in three phases: field service activities, research and development in instructional materials, and stimulating the production of new materials.

In order to accomplish these objectives the SEIMCs in Wisconsin and California have developed the following service functions: libraries of curriculum and professional materials in Special Education, information storage and retrieval services, publications to the field, in-service workshops, materials demonstrations, and consultation services.

In these two Centers the Directors estimated that approximately 90% of resources and staff time is devoted to service functions, including the development of relationships with state agencies and the establishment of associate and satellite centers.

The University of Wisconsin and the University of Southern California SEIMCs have done an outstanding job in the primary mission of establishing themselves as field-oriented change agents for Special Education in their respective regions. Ninety percent (90%) of the teachers and administrators were aware of the SEIMC in their region; over half of them were familiar with one or more of the service programs; and one-quarter of the teachers in the sample had visited a SEIMC library.

These Centers have already become a primary interface between the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, U. S. Office of Education, the State Divisions of Education for the Handicapped, the local school districts and university programs in Special Education. In this regard the SEIMC network may represent one of the most dynamic and successful field-oriented programmatic efforts in education today.

The current library holdings of the two Centers number between five and six thousand items. Over 100 teachers per month visit the libraries individually, in addition to the many teachers who visit the Centers in organized groups. The greatest use of the library facilities is by graduate students, professional personnel, and teachers within a 20-mile radius of the Center.

Field requests for library loans average 25 requests per month from individual teachers and approximately eight requests per month for sets of demonstration materials for use at local meetings. By January 1968 California had received 110 requests, and Wisconsin 40 requests for bibliographic services.

According to the Director's estimate, the library operation, including information retrieval service, accounts for approximately 40% of each Center's total effort, a greater percentage of effort than is given to any other single operation. Although the library and information retrieval services were rated as the least important SEIMC functions by teachers in the user survey, the library effort cannot, of course, be evaluated strictly on that basis. The vast majority of the teachers in the survey were well beyond the 20-mile usage radius of the libraries and did not use them directly. Nevertheless, the library operation is essential to almost every other Center function and must be evaluated in that light, too.

The publications of the SEIMCs appear to be the primary communication link with the field. The Winnower is mailed to 1700 teachers and administrators in Wisconsin and elsewhere. The Communicator and 5 x 8 cards, published by the California SEIMC, have circulations of 7,000 and 3,000 copies, respectively. Nearly all of the teachers and administrators were familiar with at least one of the publications. In the mail survey and in the interviews, teachers expressed the greatest interest in general news articles, research reviews, and articles on materials evaluation; acquisition lists received the lowest ratings. Many teachers suggested that the publications devote a greater percentage of space to the exchange of teacher ideas.

The two Centers are now conducting approximately three materials demonstrations per month at teacher meetings. Field services, in the form of displays, demonstrations, conferences and workshops, have reached roughly one-quarter of the teacher population. The teachers consider materials demonstrations and workshops the most valuable service to the field.

The major criticism of the SEIMCs in terms of not meeting stated objectives is that practically no classroom demonstrations of instructional materials have been conducted and there has been relatively little dissemination of information about teacher-developed materials. The SEIMC directors are aware of this, and valid reasons for it are presented in the body of the report. It is recommended that these objectives be re-evaluated and new approaches developed if the objectives are to be retained in network policy statements.

Wisconsin has conducted five in-service training institutes, and California has sponsored several conferences with the State Division of Education for the Handicapped. There appears to be considerably more impact and lasting value to these major functions than is achieved by materials demonstrations which are included as part of a larger program. This finding would suggest that more emphasis be placed upon well-organized institutes and less upon brief materials demonstrations conducted as part of regularly scheduled district meetings.

A close working relationship with State Education Departments appears to be essential in order to achieve success on a state-wide basis. Location of a regional center or associate center at the State capital is evidently desirable to accomplish this objective.

Contacts with graduate students in Special Education give the SEIMCs an opportunity to make a major indirect contribution to the field, as these students assume responsible positions in Special Education in a very short time. Recent graduates from the University of Southern California and the University of Wisconsin who have had contact with the SEIMCs there have already contributed to the success of Special Education programs in those regions. The SEIMCs have had relatively little influence, however, on graduate programs in other universities throughout the two regions. The obvious impact of SEIMC training upon University of Wisconsin and University of Southern California graduates would suggest that special programs be devised to reach graduate students in other universities. One- or two-day conferences or workshops held at such universities would appear to be the most fruitful approach.

Evaluation of instructional materials, research, and development of new materials account for approximately 10% of the total effort of the two SEIMC programs.

The user survey indicated very few local school districts have established procedures for evaluation of Special Education materials. At the present time evaluation procedures are very informal, in most cases relying upon the individual judgment of the teacher or coordinator of Special Education.

The primary concern of teachers and administrators in Special Education appears to be rapidly changing from a concern over the inadequate supply of educational materials to an emphasis upon evaluation and selection of educational materials. Part of the rationale for the establishment of SEIMCs was the extreme scarcity of educational materials specifically applicable to Special Education. However, this study found that availability of materials, adequacy of local instructional materials resources, and funding available for the purchase of Special Education materials have evidently improved considerably over the past three years. Approximately two-thirds of the teachers and administrators considered their local instructional materials resources and funds for the purchase of Special Education materials to be adequate.

The widespread perception of adequacy of local Special Education resources does not necessarily mean that these resources are, in fact, adequate. Not all administrators were equally sophisticated in their knowledge of new instructional material in Special Education. In some cases, satisfaction with local resources may reflect ignorance or lack of concern rather than true adequacy. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that one-third of the local school districts indicated their local resources and/or funding were inadequate. This would suggest a need for concentrating more attention upon these districts rather than attempting to provide services equally throughout the region.

During the course of the study, it became evident that the key person for effecting change in classroom practices is the person in a supervisory or consulting role who comes in frequent and direct contact with the classroom teacher. This person is not necessarily the director or coordinator of Special Education; more typically, he is an assistant director, resource teacher or supervising teacher. In planning future activities the SEIMCs would do well to make sure they are reaching these people.

INTRODUCTION

In June of 1964, the Bureau of Research, Handicapped Children and Youth Branch, U. S. Office of Education, made funds available to the University of Wisconsin and the University of Southern California for the establishment of Special Education Instructional Materials Centers. These Centers were established in the context of ongoing teacher preparation programs in Special Education at the two universities and had as their basic aim the improvement of education for the handicapped child. Corollary aims of the Centers, as national demonstration projects, were to show how such organizations could realistically meet instructional needs in Special Education on a regional scale and to suggest means by which such centers, in a national network, could meet national needs.

The experience gained from these two demonstration centers led to the establishment of a network of federally supported centers. In 1966 and 1967 twelve additional regional centers were funded, forming the Instructional Materials Center Network for Handicapped Children and Youth (IMCNHCY).

In the Spring of 1967 the American Institutes for Research entered into an agreement with the U. S. Office of Education to develop, on a pilot study basis, techniques and procedures for the evaluation of Special Education Instructional Materials Centers. A multi-stage approach was planned: The first stage, or pilot study, would focus on the development of instrumentation and the determination of relevant parameters for assessment. The second stage, following closely on the first, would have the dual purpose of collecting baseline data for all of the dimensions established in the pilot stage and preparing and implementing a full scale evaluation of all centers then extant, using approaches suggested by the pilot study results.

The third stage would build upon the preceding two by evaluating the system and translating the findings into a model for ongoing, self-correctional, operational evolution.

In the early stages of the pilot study, the major emphasis was placed upon determining relevant parameters for assessment. In the proposal which American Institutes for Research submitted to the U.S. Office of Education, it was anticipated that this evaluation would fit into a typical systems analysis design. It soon became apparent, however, that at the time this study was undertaken the network activities were in an early stage of development and had not assumed systems characteristics. Each of the regional centers had been set up as a highly autonomous unit because of unique differences in state educational structures between regions. In addition, this diversified organizational structure within the Special Education IMC network was to allow for innovation and flexibility at the regional level rather than assuming the characteristics of strong federal control.

Several conferences were held with the U.S. Office of Education personnel in the Bureau of Education for the Handicapped, with directors of several SEIMC programs, and with teachers and administrators in the field of Special Education. Site visits were made to the two prototype Centers. These activities led to a decision to utilize two types of evaluation procedures in this study. The first of these, known as "process evaluation," is concerned with the dynamic process of center development, utilizing observational data on activities related to center objectives. In order to accomplish process evaluation, it is necessary to identify the objectives of the network and the centers, then to gather information concerning the extent to which these objectives have led to appropriate implementation procedures. Such evaluation is also concerned with the problems experienced by the centers in attaining their objectives, and the evolutionary nature of their operational procedures in meeting these problems.

The second procedure adopted in this study was a survey of Special Education teachers in Wisconsin and California to determine the impact of the IMC services upon the target population. Three different survey techniques were employed in this phase of the study: a mail questionnaire sent out to 1792 Special Education teachers, follow-up interviews with 175 teachers, and in-depth interviews with 44 Special Education administrators.

The process evaluation data is presented as Part I of this study. A detailed report of the interview and mail survey results comprises Part II. *

---

*A duplicate set of data cards from the mail questionnaire survey was subsequently sent to Dr. LeRoy Aserlind at the Wisconsin SEIMC. He hoped, with the assistance of some graduate students, to be able to run the data through several statistical programs to see what additional information it might yield.

Names and addresses of the two Centers studied in this pilot evaluation are:

Special Education Instructional Materials Center
University of Wisconsin
415 West Gilman Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53706
(Director: LeRoy Aserlind, Ph. D.)

Instructional Materials Center for Special Education
University of Southern California
17 Chester Place
Los Angeles, California 90007
(Director: Robert McIntyre, Ph. D.)

PART I

PROCESS EVALUATION

Activities and Status of the SEIMCs

The two prototype demonstration Centers were funded in June 1964; however, it was the end of 1966 before the Centers became firmly established as effective field service units. This was due to limitations in budgets, staffing, and facilities, and because of the time required to establish procedures and develop relationships with other agencies and teachers in the field.

During the first two years of operation the staff of both SEIMCs was composed of the equivalent of three full-time professional positions, supplemented by part-time graduate assistants. In September 1966 the funding of the Centers was increased considerably, and the staff expanded to include the equivalent of seven full-time staff positions with an increase in graduate student assistants.

Between 1964 and 1966 both the California and Wisconsin IMCs devoted a considerable portion of their efforts toward developing the variety of procedures and forms necessary for a library operation. These include: purchasing procedures, acquisition procedures, coding process procedures, procedures for entry of information into the retrieval system, and checkout procedures for both library and information retrieval services.

In addition, it was necessary for the staff s to cultivate a wide range of relationships with educational agencies and personnel in their regions. They collected mailing lists and started publications for disseminating information about IMC services to teachers in the field. IMC staff members also made many public relations appearances before teachers' meetings throughout their regions.

Up until September 1966 the California SEIMC occupied space in the Special Education Division of the University of Southern California. At that time the SEIMC was relocated in an area of old Los Angeles commonly referred to as the Doheney Estates. This is a complex of 10 large mansions built by Edward L. Doheney around the turn of the century. Most of the buildings, other than the one housing the SEIMC, are presently being used by Mount St. Mary's College as a downtown campus. The IMC is located in a 22-room mansion which has been renovated for this purpose.

The University of Wisconsin Instructional Materials Center occupies about 2,000 sq. ft. of floor space in the University Center on Behavioral Disabilities. This building is located approximately two miles from the center of the university campus. The space allocated to the IMC contains a materials library, visual aids room, staff offices, conference room, and an IBM workroom.

The California SEIMC serves the three-state area of California, Nevada and Arizona, which has a Special Education teacher population of approximately 7,000. The Wisconsin SEIMC was originally set up to serve a seven-state area, but with the establishment of two new regional SEIMC s within the area in 1966, the Wisconsin IMC limited its direct services to the state of Wisconsin, which has approximately 1,500 Special Education teachers. In the latter part of 1967, Minnesota was added to the Wisconsin operation.

Identification of Goals and Objectives

The primary goal of the Special Education Instructional Materials Center Network is "to provide Special Educators and allied personnel with ready access to valid instructional materials and information related to the education of handicapped children." This is to be accomplished in three phases:

1. Service functions - acquisition of commercial and teacher-prepared instructional materials; describing,

classifying and cataloging these materials; disseminating information about these materials to consumers.

2. Research and development - evaluation of instructional materials and development of new materials.

3. Stimulation of production - contacting organizations with production capacity, inviting them to produce materials found to be effective in the research phase, and consulting with producers on their ideas.

The broad network goal was broken down by each Center into more operational terms with the following specific objectives:

1. Acquisition of documents and materials

   a. To serve as a central depository of curriculum materials for handicapped children by developing a library of relevant published materials and instructional devices.

   b. To develop library procedures for classifying, storing and retrieving documents, including an abstracting service for teachers and professionals in Special Education.

2. Information dissemination

   a. To publish information about the services of the SEIMCs, recent developments in Special Education, and ideas about better teaching.

   b. To develop relationships with state education departments, other state agencies, and local school districts.

c. To hold field demonstrations of instructional materials.

d. To hold seminars, conferences, and in-service workshops at the Centers.

e. To participate in state conferences.

f. To design and make available an effective information storage and retrieval service for teachers and other professionals.

g. To develop a network of associate and satellite centers within their regions.

h. To provide consultation services to teachers and administrators.

i. To relate to graduate programs in Special Education and to provide opportunities for students to assist in library and research functions.

j. To establish mobile laboratories for field demonstration.

3. Development of evaluation methodology

   a. To contact state education agencies and local school districts for evaluation procedures.

   b. To draft position papers on evaluation.

   c. To develop evaluation forms.

   d. To conduct field tests of evaluation forms and materials.

   e. To develop quantified indices for evaluation of instructional materials.

4. Development of instructional systems and materials

   a. To develop training films for teachers.

   b. To develop single concept films.

   c. To consult with publishers and manufacturers in order to encourage the development of instructional materials.

Activities Related to Achievement of Objectives

The information presented in the next two sections is based upon two site visits by the evaluation team to both SEIMCs during the period of the pilot study. At the outset of the study, it was determined that this report should not present a detailed systems analysis of internal operations; rather it should place emphasis upon the dissemination-of-information activities and the measurement of the impact of the services on the field.

The site visits revealed that the two prototype SEIMCs, in order to carry out their objectives, have evolved programs which are very similar in broad outline. The programs do differ, however, in some particulars, as will be noted below.

Service Function Activities

Library procedures were established by the time of the pilot study: both Centers have open-shelf library facilities for borrowing and browsing by teachers, graduate students and other professionals in the field; the Centers have similar procedures for borrowing materials and processing mail requests from teachers in the field. Mail requests are received from individual teachers and from school districts requesting sample materials for demonstration at local meetings.

Information retrieval systems have been developed at both Centers. The University of Southern California has a computer-based system tied in with Honeywell 2100 equipment, while the University of Wisconsin utilizes an IBM punchcard system.

The University of Wisconsin publishes a quarterly journal entitled The Winnower. This publication averages approximately 60 pages and includes professional articles and extensive acquisition lists from the Wisconsin SEIMC.

The University of Southern California has developed two publications, The Communicator, and the 5 x 8 series. The Communicator is a quarterly four-page newsletter designed to inform teachers and administrators about new materials and the field activities of the SEIMC. The 5 x 8 is a packet of 16 cards issued five times a year which presents annotated descriptions of selected instructional materials.

Both Centers have developed field demonstration programs. California has designated its field presentations as Special Education Exchange Conferences (SEE Conferences) and has attempted to focus on the exchange between teachers of ideas concerning educational materials and methods. Wisconsin has not stressed the "exchange" aspect of the program so explicitly. In actual practice, however, the California and Wisconsin presentations, which are usually held in conjunction with teachers' conferences at the local or district level, have a remarkably similar format.

In-service workshops at the SEIMC have been a focal point of the Wisconsin operation, and regularly scheduled all-day conferences have had an average attendance of approximately 60 teachers. The University of Southern California has not devoted as much effort as Wisconsin to this aspect of the program; however, California has co-sponsored several conferences with the State Department of Special Education, including two week-long state level conferences.

In both cases the prototype demonstration Centers have been set up in close cooperation with their respective state departments of education. In Wisconsin the state director of Special Education serves as a co-director of the Center. During the first two years of operation, staff members from both Centers have made numerous public relations presentations at teachers' meetings and conferences throughout their regions to introduce the services of the SEIMC to the field.

Consultation services, primarily of a semi-formal nature, are a constant activity of both Centers. These consultation services range from giving information about library materials through assistance in planning of major school programs at the district level.

Both of the SEIMC programs reside in university settings and are closely interrelated with the graduate program in Special Education. In each case the director of the Materials Center is also Head of the Special Education department. Numerous graduate students come in close and constant contact with the Center operations as assistants in the programs, and several have completed theses related to evaluation of educational material.

Activities in the Development of Evaluation Methodology

In comparison with the service functions, the evaluation of materials has played a small role up to this point of development. This does not reflect a lack of concern over evaluation; on the contrary, the staff of both Centers are vitally concerned over the problem. But it has been necessary to channel most of the effort into service functions in order to achieve an operational level. The activities in evaluation have centered on the development of teacher rating scales of the adequacy of borrowed instructional materials and the development of quantified indices for evaluation of materials.

Development of Instructional Materials

In the first two years of operations, California was engaged in a major development effort in the form of a language instructional guide for multiple-handicapped children. Wisconsin participated in a more modest effort, field testing materials in cooperation with a non-profit organization. At the present time several smaller development projects are in process in California.

Percentage of Effort Related to Activities

The research design of the pilot study called for analysis of service functions on a cost-effectiveness basis. However, the most important activities of the Centers at this period of their development are of a very diffuse nature, e.g., the establishment of relationships with state agencies and local school districts, the development of associate and satellite centers throughout their regions, relationships with graduate school programs, etc. These activities cross categories to such an extent that a cost-effectiveness analysis could not yield a true picture of the operation at this time.

Directors were asked to estimate the percentage of effort devoted to these general categories: service functions, research and evaluation activities, stimulation of the development of new materials. In addition, service functions were broken down into two sub-categories, library operations and field services.

The estimates given independently by the two directors are highly similar. In each case service functions account for approximately 90% of effort, as compared with 10% devoted to research, evaluation and stimulating production of new materials.

The library operations account for 40% of total Center effort. This figure includes the development of information storage and retrieval systems.

Effort devoted to publications ranges from 15% to 20% of the total.

Direct field activities, such as materials demonstrations, displays, workshops, conferences, etc. comprise approximately 25% of the total effort.

Because of limited staffing, all members of the staff are engaged in all activities to a greater or lesser degree at this stage of development, and most of the service functions are of an overlapping nature. It is clear, however, that very little effort is devoted to evaluation and material development as compared with service functions and that the library operation comprises the largest single activity of the Centers.

Performance Data on the Operation, Implementation and Administration of Programmed Activities

Since many of the programs of the two Centers are similar in nature, the performance data will be presented as a composite report. It should be underscored that the purpose of this evaluation study is to develop process evaluation procedures for internal use; the intention is not to develop performance standards for the network nor to make value judgment comparisons between the two Centers.

Acquisition of Documents, Materials and Educational Devices

The California and Wisconsin SEIMCs had each acquired between 5,000 and 6,000 items of material by the end of 1967. Approximately 80% of the acquisitions have been coded and shelved. Both classroom instructional materials and professional publications in all major categories of Special Education comprise the holdings of the libraries. During the period of this report, emphasis shifted from a general enlargement of all categories of holdings to the acquisition of materials within specific areas which need enlarging. The acquisition budgets of the two operations are presently $10,000 to $12,000 per year.

A major policy difference between the two operations has been that Wisconsin has refrained from accepting any unsolicited materials from publishers, whereas California has accepted such materials and introduced them into the system since the beginning of its operation. One of the reasons for the Wisconsin policy is that acceptance of such materials might imply an endorsement of these materials by the SEIMC. Wisconsin, however, has had some problems in this area because University regulations restrict the purchase of certain materials. The California SEIMC had acquired over 2,000 free items for its library even before receiving any funds for acquisitions.

Usage of Library Materials

Each Center reports that over 100 individual teachers visit the library each month for browsing and examination of materials. In addition, teachers visit the library in groups (ranging in size from 10 to 30 people) at the rate of about eight groups per month. These figures represent only 25% to 30% of the total library visitors, as graduate students and other university personnel are the primary source of "walk-in traffic."

At the time of this report mail requests from individual teachers in the field average 20 to 30 requests per month. In addition, the Centers receive six to 10 requests per month for packets of sample instructional materials to be demonstrated at local teachers' meetings.

Library items which are requested most are reading materials of high interest/low vocabulary at the secondary level. Following this are requests for perceptual materials, form boards, puzzles, etc. Requests for records, manipulative devices in arithmetic, and language materials follow in that order. It was noted that requests for manipulative devices are increasing steadily, and it is anticipated that within the next year these requests will equal those for classroom workbooks and text material.

The experience of the Centers and the results of the user survey presented in Part II of this report indicate that the library does not directly serve many teachers beyond a radius of approximately 20 miles from the Center. The library function, which accounts for the greatest amount of effort at each Center, is rated as one of the least valuable services by teachers in the region as a whole. The library effort cannot, of course, be evaluated strictly on that basis. The vast majority of the teachers in the survey were well beyond the 20-mile usage radius and did not use the libraries directly. Nevertheless, the library operation is essential to almost every other Center function and must be evaluated in that light, too.

Information Retrieval Services

California has placed considerably more emphasis upon information retrieval services than Wisconsin. The Information Retrieval and Up-dating Service (IRUS) at California is now fully operational. The past year has been devoted to solving problems of modifying the original IRUS program so that the versatility of the IBM datatext Remote Terminal could be combined with the existing Honeywell facilities at USC. This involved piloting input procedures, developing conversion routines, modifying the original updating routine, and developing a program for correcting errors.

The program is a COBOL program which utilizes a 15-digit numeric descriptor system. Both conjunctive and disjunctive retrieval operations can be pursued with respect to any one or a combination of the search fields. Code numbers in the generic description search field are coordinated with the ERIC Thesaurus. In the latter part of 1967 the Honeywell equipment was equipped with a disc drive which allows for random access retrieval. During 1967 the California SEIMC processed 110 bibliographic search requests.

Wisconsin does not presently have a computer storage and retrieval system and does not anticipate the need for such in the coming year. During 1967 the Wisconsin SEIMC processed less than 40 bibliographic searches.

Publications

An analysis of interviews with classroom teachers and the mail questionnaire survey indicates that the publications of the two Centers are the primary communication link with the classroom teacher and play a key role in the dissemination of information about Center activities. The Winnower is mailed to approximately 1700 people throughout the region served by Wisconsin and to many organizations and professionals throughout the country. This publication is mailed to all state divisions of Special Education. The Communicator has a quarterly circulation of approximately 7,000 copies, while the 5 x 8 cards are sent out to approximately 3,000 teachers within the California region.

Considerable detailed information is presented in Part II of this report concerning teachers' evaluation of the content of these publications. Since there are few publications directed to the Special Education teacher on the subject of educational materials developed especially for this field, these publications are considered a valuable resource by the teachers.

There were frequent suggestions that these publications should devote a greater percentage of space to the exchange of teachers' ideas than is presently the practice.

Demonstrations, Displays and Conferences

Wisconsin and California both reported that approximately 12 material display exhibits per year had been set up at state conferences and conventions. Wisconsin considered these exhibits to be the best public relations approach for the SEIMC. Representatives from the Centers have frequently appeared on the program of these meetings, explaining the services of the SEIMC.

Prior to June 1967 the California Center held six SEE Conferences (Special Education Exchange Conferences). These conferences were in the areas of physically handicapped, educationally handicapped, and trainable mentally retarded. Approximately 300 teachers attended. In September 1967 the field staff was expanded to include three teams of two members each, and since that time three SEE conferences per month have been scheduled.

The SEE Conferences were designed to promote an exchange of ideas among teachers and to emphasize teacher-constructed materials; however, this objective has not been reached. In actual practice, these conferences have usually been scheduled as part of a local or district meeting and only two or three hours have been available to the SEIMC on these programs. A typical presentation includes a display of 20 or 30 commercial materials, sometimes a display of teacher-developed material; but the actual demonstration is usually limited to three or four items of selected instructional materials.

Wisconsin has been putting on approximately two or three materials demonstrations per month at local school district meetings. These demonstrations are usually about an hour in length and include the display of materials and an explanation of one or two selected items.

Wisconsin has emphasized in-service-training institutes for teachers. These all-day workshops have typically been held in Madison, Wisconsin, and have been attended by a total of approximately 300 teachers. Training institutes have been held on evaluation method, programmed instruction, learning disabilities, speech and language development, and mathematics for Special Education. The USC Center has co-sponsored with the California State Division of Special Education two major week-long conferences at the state level, one in San Diego, and one in Sacramento. The Sacramento conference was attended by over 200 Special Education administrators.

The interviews with teachers and administrators indicated that both the in-service-training institutes and the California conferences were considered of outstanding value to the participants. There appears to be considerably more impact and lasting value to these major conferences than is achieved by the materials demonstrations which are included as one part of a larger program. At this relatively early stage of development, it is difficult to make a definitive statement on what will be the most effective approach to field demonstrations; however, on the basis of the above information, it would appear that the SEIMCs should concentrate their field efforts more on the development of one-or two-day special conferences rather than attempt to make brief presentations at regularly scheduled teacher meetings.

The strongest criticism in this report, in terms of not meeting stated objectives, is the fact that neither of the two prototypes Centers have engaged in actual classroom demonstrations and have disseminated relatively little information about teacher-developed materials. The directors of the two Centers readily admit this.

The lack of classroom demonstrations is evidently due to restricted staffing. This is particularly true when a large amount of travel time is involved. In order to cope with this problem, the California Center has drawn up proposals for the funding of mobile laboratories, while the Wisconsin Center has recently received funds for the development of a video tape unit. They will experiment with the use of video taped presentation of materials demonstrations as one solution to the problem.

There has been a conscious reluctance on the part of the Centers to work with teacher-developed materials in terms of evaluation or assistance in production, because of the public domain issue. As the law now reads, it is possible that such assistance might infringe upon the teacher's or publisher's opportunity to gain copyright privileges. This is an important point; however, it would appear that the SEIMCs could play a greater role in disseminating information about such materials without infringing upon copyright privileges.

Relationships with State Agencies

Although this function may be the least tangible of all activities in terms of direct measurement, it is undoubtedly one of the most important functions of the SEIMCs. This is particularly true in Wisconsin because the SEIMC is located in the capital city, and the state has a highly organized Special Education program.

The organizational structure of the Wisconsin SEIMC includes a co-director who is an assistant superintendent of the state educational system and Director of the State Bureau for Handicapped Children and Youth. While he has not been an active member of the Center operation, he serves an important function as the primary communication link with the state educational system and thus, indirectly, with teachers and administrators. The Wisconsin SEIMC reported that information about the Center is spread daily by state supervisors from the Bureau for Handicapped Children.

Strong relationships with the state department of education are vital to the Wisconsin SEIMC in planning field services and satellite centers and otherwise serving those teachers who are remote from the regional Center. Wisconsin found, for example, that the northern and central part of the state, which is a rural area, was very poorly represented at its in-service conferences. State department of education memos now help to publicize these conferences. Rural and urban problems in Special Education are different, and state department expertise can help in planning the type of satellite center which best serves its particular population.

SEIMCs in both Wisconsin and California are assuming the role of primary interface between university programs and public school systems in Special Education. This has been particularly true in the Wisconsin region where, for example, the planning sessions for a satellite center in St. Paul brought together representatives from the St. Paul school system, the Minnesota State Department of Education, and the University of Minnesota, as well as SEIMC representatives.

In the Los Angeles County area, the California SEIMC has assumed a role similar to that of the Wisconsin SEIMC in its relations with the Wisconsin State Department of Education. But the California SEIMC has not been as effective in this role throughout its region for a variety of reasons beyond the control of the SEIMC staff. These reasons include such factors as the large teacher population in the region, the complex educational structure within California, and the fact that the SEIMC is located over 300 miles from the state capital.

Furthermore, the California operation has from the beginning involved three states. California has been very successful in its relationship with Arizona, but has recently run into a major problem in serving the State of Nevada since that state has discontinued Special Education as a separate administrative structure within the state educational system. SEIMC services in that area are now limited to distribution of publications to teachers who hold membership in the SEIMC.

It seems apparent that SEIMCs are most effective when working in a close relationship with a single state education department. This, of course, is not possible on a regional basis, but the establishment of associate centers located close to state departments in the various states in a region may accomplish this objective. Such associate centers have been set up in Minnesota and Arizona, but they have not been in existence long enough to evaluate their effectiveness.

Development of Associate and Satellite Centers

The funding for two associate centers in Minnesota was received in January of 1968. One of these centers will be at the University of Minnesota and the other will be located in the Minnesota State Department of Education. These two centers will develop services in the state of Minnesota to a much greater extent than has been feasible over the past three years.

Within the state of Wisconsin an associate center has been funded in Janesville and became operational in September 1967. This Center has received Title III funds in the amount of $35,000 and has a staff of three full-time professionals. In June 1967 a $20,000 planning grant was received by the Milwaukee Public School System for the development of a satellite SEIMC. It is anticipated that this Center will become operational in June 1968.

Proposals have been prepared and submitted for the development of two additional satellite centers within the state of Wisconsin.

In the California region, an associate center is operational in Arizona and two satellite centers have been established in Downey and in Kern County, California. The major effort by the California SEIMC has been to assist in the development of a state plan for the funding of 10 satellite centers within the state public educational structure. These satellites are to be set up within the context of ongoing instructional materials centers for regular education. A proposal has been drawn up and submitted for the funding of these centers; however, at the time of this report official action had not been taken.

The two regional SEIMCs have played a key role in the development of these sub-centers which should greatly enhance the effectiveness of services to Special Education personnel throughout the regions.

Consultive Services

The two site visits made it clear that all of the professional staff members are daily engaged in a large amount of consultation at various levels ranging from informal phone conversations to formal consultations in preparation of grant proposals. Wisconsin maintained records of its consultation activities between June 1966 and June 1967. During that period 136 consultations were recorded.

Relationships with Graduate Programs

A major factor in setting up both of the prototype demonstration projects in the universities where they are located is the fact that both universities have active graduate programs in Special Education. It was necessary to get local contributions of space and services in order for the programs to qualify for federal support. Graduate students have played a major role in the development of both Centers and have comprised a large portion of the non-professional staff. Several theses and dissertations have been undertaken in the area of evaluation of Special Education materials.

The relationships with graduate programs represent another very important "product" of the Special Education Instructional Materials Centers. Several graduate students who have worked in the Centers have remained in the field of educational materials after graduation. Three of these graduates are already located in associate and satellite centers. Four are educational consultants to major school districts within the regions served by the SEIMCs, and four have joined the staffs of the regional Centers as professional personnel.

The library facilities of the SEIMCs serve a very valuable function for the graduate programs. At both California and Wisconsin the Special Education section of the graduate school library has been merged with the SEIMC library and has been responsible for the addition of many professional publications.

Up to this point, however, there has been a lack of close association with other Special Education graduate training programs throughout the regions served. Although considerable informal communication exists among the various university training programs in each of the regions, the other universities have not tended to take full advantage of the services available at the SEIMCs. The Centers report that groups of graduate students in Special Education from other university programs have visited the SEIMCs, but few presentations have been made by staff members at these universities.

Evaluation of Materials

As noted earlier in this report, the two regional SEIMCs are devoting a relatively small percentage of effort directly to the evaluation of educational materials. During 1967 there was a continually accelerating effort devoted to evaluation, and it is anticipated that during 1968 the amount of effort devoted to this area will be further increased.

Both the California and Wisconsin SEIMCs have published position papers on evaluation of instructional materials and staff members from the Centers have published articles on this topic in professional journals.

The Wisconsin statement emphasizes the need for coordination of research and evaluation on the network level, which would have the advantages of joint development of techniques, avoidance of duplication, and continuous output. Suggested guidelines for achieving network coordination are: (1) let each center work along its own line of preference for a time; (2) at the end of the exploratory phase, representatives from the centers should meet and prepare a document which would provide terminology for inter-center communication, show areas of common interest, as well as areas needing more attention; (3) once areas of interest are established, a central mechanism should be set up to insure coordination of efforts; and (4) an overall plan should be developed for the network program and review techniques established.

The Wisconsin paper discusses the evaluation mechanics of questionnaires, physical measurements, quantified indices, and variable controlled research.

The California paper discusses the utilization of professional judgment as an evaluation technique, using SEIMC staff personnel, a panel of "experts," master teachers, and teachers' field evaluation of materials which they borrow from the Center. Widespread field-testing procedures and carefully designed experimental situations under controlled instruction conditions are discussed.

To date, California's efforts in evaluation have been concentrated upon the development of evaluation forms to be sent out with loaned materials. These forms ask the teacher to rate the materials on several variables. The instrument has undergone a series of limited field tests and several revisions. It is anticipated that this will be in use as a data collection instrument early in 1968.

Wisconsin has emphasized the evaluation of instructional materials to a greater extent than California, even though this accounts for a relatively small percentage of their total Center effort. The Wisconsin efforts are largely centered around the development of quantified indices for the conduct of field evaluation. A major problem in field evaluation is the large number of variables impinging upon performance in the field situation. Therefore, a major concern is variable control. At least three master's theses and two doctoral dissertations have been devoted to the identification and measurement of the variables as well as statistical methods for dealing with large numbers of variables simultaneously.

Stimulating the Development of Instructional Materials

In the first two years of its operation, the California SEIMC engaged in a major development project which resulted in the publication of a language instructional guide for multiple-handicapped children. This guide was field tested in 22 classrooms for exceptional children in Los Angeles and evaluated by representatives of 20 agencies in California, 12 other states and five foreign countries.

The Wisconsin effort has been limited to the field testing of materials in cooperation with a non-profit organization ("MIXIE the PIXIE" series) and the cooperative production of visual perception materials with a sheltered workshop.

As pointed out earlier, the Centers have been reluctant to assist in the development of teacher-produced materials because of the public domain issue.

The California SEIMC is currently engaged in several modest development projects in connection with local school districts and institutions. These include the development of material for vocational training of secondary level educable retardates, single concept film cartridges for use with trainable retardates, and teacher education films on trainable and educable retarded.

Other Activities

The Wisconsin SEIMC has pioneered international relationships in the area of instructional materials for the mentally retarded. Dr. LeRoy Aserlind, Director of the Wisconsin SEIMC, was chairman of a panel on instructional materials in the International Conference on Mental Retardation held in Montpelier, France, in September 1967. Through the efforts of Dr. Aserlind a sizable collection of instructional materials was donated by American manufacturers and set up as a permanent exhibit in Europe.

The Wisconsin Center has also been engaged in an experimental summer laboratory school program in Madison, Wisconsin, over the past two years. Starting in early 1968 a full semester course in Instructional Materials is being offered through the extension division of the University of Wisconsin. The SEIMC field coordinator will be the instructor for the course.

Both Centers devote a small portion of their efforts to direct and indirect intra-network activities. These activities include abstracting, the monthly intra-network newsletter, exchange of acquisition lists, preparation of position papers, quarterly and yearly reports, membership on sub-committees and attendance at semi-annual network conferences.

As noted earlier in the report, the pilot study has not attempted to analyze network activities or inter-center relationships because the network is at such an early stage of development.

Conclusion

The experiences of the two prototype Centers raise many questions which must be considered by all Center directors and staff members as they evaluate present programs and plan future activities.

First there is the question of how a regional center can most effectively reach teachers throughout the region and maintain strong relationships with state education agencies, other university programs, etc. The associate and satellite center program developed to meet these needs is well on its way.

Another major question revolves around the library operation. As mentioned above, it accounts for the greatest amount of effort at each Center; yet, if one of the main emphases of the SEIMC is to be service to teachers in the field, this seems to be the service they appreciate least. This may be because most of them are as yet too far away from a regional or satellite center to use a library directly, and they do not understand its indirect service to them. The development of satellite centers will alleviate this. In the meantime, the library operation is essential to evaluation, research and development activities, training of graduate students, materials demonstrations, and almost all other center functions. Each center, therefore, will have to ask this question: What is the optimal amount of effort which should go into the library operation--at this center, at this time--if all center objectives are to be realized?

Each center must likewise arrive at a decision on such questions as whether or not to accept free library materials from publishers and manufacturers. The experiences of the older Centers illustrate some advantages and some disadvantages.

There is also the question of "public domain" and copyright privileges in regard to teacher-developed materials. Is there some approach to this problem that would enable the Centers to do more than they are now doing toward their professed goal of encouraging the development of such materials?

With regard to Center publications, several teachers mentioned the tremendous competition for the classroom teacher's time and attention. Some spoke of being "flooded" with literature from publishers, professional organizations, etc. If SEIMC publications are to compete with this, they must compare favorably in visual attractiveness, format, interest level, etc. How far can or should SEIMC publications go in this direction?

Increased network development and the exchange of experiences and ideas between Centers will help each Center individually and the network collectively to work toward the answers to these questions.

PART II

USER SURVEY

Objectives of the Survey

One of the major purposes of the pilot study of the Special Education Instructional Materials Center Network was to develop survey methodology for collecting information on the user population. Three methods were used in this survey: A mail questionnaire sent to Special Education teachers in the areas served by the two Special Education IMCs, follow-up interviews with 175 of these teachers, interviews with 44 Special Education administrators.

More specifically, the objectives of these field research activities were to:

A. Determine material and procedural needs.

B. Determine ways IMCs have been used.

C. Determine the importance and usefulness of the IMCs in meeting specific needs.

D. Obtain responses to questions based on the specific activities and objectives of the IMC.

E. Obtain suggested modifications to the IMC program.

F. Develop instrumentation and methodological approaches for economical and effective larger scale evaluations within the service areas of the other IMCs which have been established.

Methodology of the Survey

Mail Questionnaire

The mail questionnaire was sent to 693 teachers of Special Education in the state of Wisconsin and 1099 in the California IMCSE area (California, Nevada and Arizona).* The list of Special Education teachers in Wisconsin (numbering approximately 1500) was supplied by the Wisconsin Bureau for Handicapped Children. An attempt had been made to restrict this list to teachers of the mentally retarded. In the California area, lists of Special Education teachers and administrators had been gathered by the IMCSE from the various counties in the 3-state area to assemble a mailing list for IMCSE publications. The mailing list for the user survey in the California area was based on a list of those educators (approximately 2500) who had made some contact with the IMCSE or had been contacted by the IMCSE and a membership card issued. An attempt was made to remove from both lists the names of administrators, supervisory personnel, and all others who were not classroom teachers. The survey booklet was sent to every second name on the refined lists.

A short follow-up survey was conducted by interview with a limited number of respondents and a smaller number of non-respondents. Direct contact was made either by face-to-face interviews or by phone interviews. The field costs for extensive personal interview are high, so phone contact was used in a situation in which a great deal of data had been previously collected from the mail response. The phone approach, of course, was not practical with the non-respondents as they had not returned any of the initial information.

It was thought that the most fruitful approach to objective F would be to introduce a variety of format variables in the mailing to determine which appeared most effective in increasing response rates. (Results of this approach are detailed in Appendix C, which describes the variables in the mailing package and discusses the combined mail-interview technique, particularly its implications for future surveys.)

---

*To avoid endless repetition of these three state names, the California IMCSE region, or respondents from that region, are referred to with just the word "California." It should be understood that this means the entire California IMCSE service area, which of course includes Nevada and Arizona as well as California.

Based upon pilot interviews conducted in the Washington area, a structured mail survey instrument was designed. The 4-page survey booklet presented 39 questions. (See Appendix D for samples of the survey booklets.) While there were slight modifications between the instruments used in California and Wisconsin, they both covered these general areas in detail:

A. Background Information on Teacher: Subject area teaching, distance from IMC, age level of students, number of years teaching, number of years teaching Special Education subjects, number of years teaching in current state, amount of training in Special Education.

B. School System Information: Number of Special Education teachers, degree of support for Special Education programs, monetary support for teaching materials, organization of Special Education classes, number of Special Education classes in subject's school.

C. Evaluation of Present Materials: Materials used most often, materials which are most effective, the best materials now available, subject areas where there is greatest need for improvement, materials most in need of improvement, approaches to improving teacher information, importance of sources of information, current methods for materials approval, importance of types of information, use of sources of information, extent to which present resources meet materials needs.

D. The Special Education Instructional Materials Center: Familiarity with, source of knowledge about, previous visits to, why not visited or used, evaluation of publications, attendance at in-service conferences, exposure to materials displays, use of search resources, attendance at workshops or institutes, exposure to field demonstrations, impact of IMC on local education, importance of IMC functions, methods of improving IMC services.

Realizing that the strict closed-end format would tend to reduce the value of responses to some questions, an additional sheet was attached on which the respondents could expand their answers. Analysis of certain response patterns indicated that such additional comment was quite helpful in interpreting the closed response data. An overall 75% of the responding subjects made additional comments.

Interviews with Special Education Teachers

A face-to-face and phone follow-up to the mail survey was planned with subjects in Wisconsin and California to accomplish the following objectives:

A. Expand certain categories of information already collected through the mail instrument.

B. Explore certain new categories of information.

C. Conduct a small sub-study of non-respondents to see if their responses differed greatly from those of respondents.

One hundred and seventy-five (175) interviews were conducted with a distribution as shown below:

TABLE 1

WISCONSIN	Personal	Phone	N
Respondent	39	25	64
Non-Respondent	31	0	31
	70	25	95

CALIFORNIA	Personal	Phone	N
Respondent	21	43	64
Non-Respondent	16	0	16
	37	43	80

Subjects for interviews were basically selected on the following:

A. Distance from the IMC - subjects were grouped into specific geographic areas for ease of interviewing. In Wisconsin interview points included Madison, Milwaukee, and Green Bay, with surrounding towns included. In California, the center points were Los Angeles and San Francisco. The areas covered also represented diversity in the nature of the school districts and degree of urbanization.

B. Within each defined area, all subjects were considered as representing the sample universe. The universe was divided into respondents and non-respondents depending on returns to 7 November 1967. Quota sampling controlled mainly by budgetary considerations was used to cover as many subjects as possible in the two categories.

Interviews were carried out between 13 November and 15 December by a group of subcontractors and AIR personnel.

There were no non-respondents interviewed via telephone as each was requested to complete the mail survey instrument in the presence of the interviewer. The instrument asked for all the basic background information of interest, so this approach served to obtain this as well as other data directly comparable to respondent returns. Completion time for the personal or phone interview, exclusive of non-respondents, was between 15 and 30 minutes.

The following are the subjects covered in the follow-up interviews:

A. Use of teaching materials. Which are most effective, which need the greatest improvement.

B. Best roles for IMCs. Which would be most important (not for phone), service areas in which to concentrate.

C. Personal visits to IMCs. Visits made, why or why not, types of useful information gathered, activities during or as a result of visit.

D. Exposure to IMC materials demonstrations. Types of material seen, applications, suggested improvements.

E. IMC Publications. Familiarity, subscriptions, use, value, suggested improvements.

F. IMC Conferences. Familiarity, past attendance, subject covered, application, value, suggested improvements.

Interviews with Special Education Administrators

In addition to the questionnaires mailed to Special Education teachers and follow-up interviews with teachers, the user survey also included 44 in-depth interviews with administrative personnel in the field of Special Education. The vast majority of these interviews were held in Sacramento, California, at a five-day conference of Special Education administrators. Approximately 80% of the interviewees were coordinators or directors of Special Education programs at the local school district level, the remaining 20%, school principals.

Survey Findings

Mail Questionnaire to Special Education Teachers

Of the 1792 questionnaires sent to Special Education teachers in Wisconsin and in the California IMCSE area, replies were received from 588 (including 40 from Nevada and Arizona), an overall response rate of 33.5%. As shown below in Table 2, the rate of return in Wisconsin (45.6%) was considerably higher than the rate of return in California (25.7%). Some possible reasons for this are discussed in Appendix C.

TABLE 2

Summary of Returns to Mail Survey	Wisconsin	California	Total
Total in original mailing	693	1099	1792
Less: Returned as Unknown	2	26	28
Less: Claimed not to teach Spec. Ed.	1	5	6
Less: Refusal to answer	1	1	2
	689	1067	1756
Total returned	314	274	588
Percent of Adjusted Rate	(45.6%)	(25.7%)	(33.5%)

(See Table 3, Appendix A for more details on Mail Survey Returns.)

The findings presented in this section are based upon these 588 responses. Some tabular material is included in the text of this section. The full presentation of tabular material on the overall response is in Appendix A, which provides more detailed information on the number and percentage of responses in each category. Table numbers in parentheses below refer to the tables in Appendix A. Question numbers refer to the survey booklet, a copy of which is in Appendix D.

Characteristics of the Respondents

The survey findings discussed here are based on the overall response from both Wisconsin and California. Some California / Wisconsin differences are noted below; a complete tabulation of the separate California and Wisconsin responses is given in Appendix B.

Approximately three quarters of all the Special Education teachers returning the questionnaire were teachers of the mentally retarded. Most of them (62%) were teaching in the field of educable mentally retarded. The remaining 25% were distributed among a variety of other classifications within Special Education (Table 4, Q. 1).

There were important differences between Wisconsin and California respondents with regard to teaching area: As noted earlier, an attempt had been made in Wisconsin to restrict the mailing list to teachers of the mentally retarded, so that nearly all (95%) of the Wisconsin respondents were teachers of the mentally retarded, 82% of them concerned especially with the educable mentally retarded. In California the mailing list was not thus restricted, with the result that the proportion of respondents teaching the mentally retarded was 54%, 39% specifically involved with the educable mentally retarded. The rest of the California respondents represented many areas of Special Education, including teachers of the trainable, teachers of the deaf and blind, of children with speech problems, emotional disturbances, physical handicaps, learning disabilities, etc.

Two-thirds of the teachers had had over nine years' teaching experience (Table 5, Q. 3) and had been teaching in the field of Special Education for four years or more (Table 6, Q. 4). Few of the respondents had been teaching in their respective states for less than three years (Table 7, Q. 5), so it is probable that the majority of them were familiar with the policies and procedures within their state educational structure.

Seventy-nine percent (79%) of the teachers included in the survey were certified in Special Education (Table 8, Q. 6). The investigators had not anticipated such a high percentage of the teachers would have fulfilled certification requirements. This may be a bias associated with the mailing lists.

The teachers in the sample taught at all grade levels ranging from students under seven years of age to over 16 years of age (Table 9, Q. 2). Approximately one-quarter of the sample taught in schools where there was only one Special Education class, nearly half taught in schools having between two and five Special Education classes, and the remainder taught in schools with six or more Special Education classes (Table 10, Q. 13).

Characteristics of the School Districts

Approximately one-half of the sample came from small school districts (20 or less Special Education teachers), 16% from moderate size school districts (21-40 Special Education teachers), and 27% from districts with over 60 Special Education teachers (Table 11, Q. 7).

In an attempt to isolate differences of emphasis placed upon Special Education programs, teachers were asked to rate the strength of administrative support given to Special Education in their school districts. Approximately two-thirds of the sample perceived administrative support to Special Education programs as equal to or stronger than the support given regular education programs. And nearly 80% felt the school principal's support of Special Education programs was equal to or stronger than his support of regular education programs (Table 12, Q. 8 and Table 13, Q. 9).

The above ratings seem to indicate that most teachers do not perceive their problems as attributable to personnel or policies unique to their particular school district; rather it can be assumed that the problems reflect the state of the art in Special Education in general. This view is substantiated by the fact that the survey team found relatively little difference in this factor between the two states surveyed.

Another factor which could be expected to play a major role in the availability of Special Education materials is lack of funds. This did not appear to be a major factor, however, since two-thirds of the teachers stated that their school budgets allow for the purchase of more than 80% of the regular classroom materials they feel they need. In addition, nearly 60% of the teachers felt that their budgets allowed them to purchase over 80% of the supplementary materials needed. See Tables 14 and 15:

TABLE 14

(Question 10)

Extent to which school budget allows teacher to purchase regular classroom materials	N	Percent
Over 90% of materials needed	260	45%
80-90% of materials needed	122	21%
60-80% of materials needed	119	21%
Less than 50%	76	13%

TABLE 15

(Question 11)

Extent to which school budget allows teacher to purchase supplementary materials	N	Percent
Over 90% of materials needed	188	33%
80-90% of materials needed	147	25%
60-80% of materials needed	116	20%
Less than 50% of materials needed	128	22%

Approximately one in ten of the respondents taught at more than one school. Most respondents, however, taught only at the one school to which they were assigned (Table 16, Q. 12).

Knowledge and Use of SEIMC Services

The vast majority of the respondents (over 90%) in both the teacher mail survey and the administrative interviews were familiar with the existence of the Special Education Instructional Materials Center in their region. One-quarter of the sample had only a rather vague general concept of the IMC and knew very little about its program or services. Fifty-three percent (53%) stated that they were somewhat familiar with its operation, and 13% were highly familiar with its programs and services (Table 17, Q. 26).

Question 27 in the survey booklet asked teachers how they had heard about the SEIMC. As Table 18 indicates, there was great diversity in their answers. Knowledge of the SEIMC could be directly traced to presentations by staff members of the SEIMC by only one in four of the teachers. A somewhat larger number had heard about the IMC from their own supervisors or directors. The variety of "other" sources written in on the answer sheets indicates that information about the SEIMCs is being disseminated through many different kinds of public relations channels, including various publications, meetings and conferences, schools and universities.

TABLE 18

(Question 27)

Source of information about the SEIMC	N	Percent
Supervisor or Director	149	28%
Representatives from SEIMC	139	26%
Other teachers	93	17%
Other (meetings, publications, schools and universities, talks at conferences, etc.)	161	30%

More than one-quarter of the teachers responding to the mail survey questionnaire had paid one or more visits to the IMC Library (Table 19, Q. 28). The most common reason reported for not using the library resources was the fact that the Center is too far away to be used effectively. This factor is, of course, well recognized by the SEIMC directors in all of the regions and has stimulated the development of associate and satellite centers to make the services more available to Special Education teachers throughout their regions. Table 20, Q.29 shows other reasons for not using library resources, and some of these are likewise of interest. For instance, although only 8% of the respondents reported (in answer to Q. 26) that they had never heard of the SEIMC, 27% felt that they didn't know enough about it to use its library resources.

TABLE 20

(Question 29)

Main reasons for not using library resources	N	Percent
Doesn't know enough about it	139	27%
Other groups do as well in providing materials	15	3%
Not enough time to incorporate IMC into schedule	57	11%
Too far away to use effectively	227	44%
Other (Center new, new teacher, hours or operating conditions at Center)	50	10%
Not applicable	29	6%

The publications of the two SEIMCs appear to be a primary communication link with the field. Over 80% of the sample had received at least one copy of The Winnower or 5 x 8 and nearly 60% of the sample considered it to be of definite value to them in their teaching (Table 21, Q. 30).

Wisconsin teachers were asked which items in The Winnower they found most valuable. The "general articles" were of most value to them, followed by selections concerning "materials evaluation" and "research reviews." (In the personal interviews, "research reviews" were cited as most valuable.) In both the mail questionnaire and interview survey, the acquisition lists were noted as least valuable (Table 22, Q. 31W).

Question 31 in the California survey booklet asked the respondents for an evaluation of The Communicator. In spite of the fact that the California mailing was based on a list of teachers who supposedly had been receiving The Communicator regularly, some 40% of the California respondents checked response A, i. e., "Never received it." There may have been some misunderstanding about this question, or perhaps some respondents did not recognize the word "Communicator" as the title of the IMCSE newsletter. Thirty-six percent of the California respondents reported that they had received The Communicator and considered it of definite value to them in their teaching. The remainder received it and considered it of general interest only (Table 23, Q. 31C).

An evaluation of field services presents some problems because of the wide variety of terms used to refer to the various services offered. The terms "workshop," "institute," "in-service training conferences," "materials display," and "materials demonstration" all have overlapping meanings, and the responses to survey questions concerning these services appear to be confounded. Ten percent (10%) of the sample reported attendance at workshops or institutes, 16% reported having seen a field demonstration, 29% have attended in-service training conferences, and 35% have seen material display exhibits (Tables 24, 25, 26 & 27, Q. 22, 33, 35, 36). These figures average approximately 22%, which may be most representative of exposure to the various field service functions. A much larger percentage of the teachers have undoubtedly heard presentations by IMC representatives at various state meetings and conventions, but these appearances should probably be classified as public relations presentations rather than material demonstrations. A survey of responses indicates that most of the teachers have found these field services to be of value.

An analysis of the interview data concerning the perceived value of these services indicates that most teachers found them to be extremely beneficial, but it was frequently difficult for these teachers to identify specific materials and concepts picked up from these meetings. Any "conference attenders" among the readership of this report would probably find themselves in a similar circumstance reporting on the results of any particular conference several months after the fact.

The information retrieval service had been used by a little more than one in 10 of the teachers surveyed, 11% of them having requested a bibliographic search one or more times (Table 28, Q. 34).

Three questions were included in the survey in an attempt to get the users' overall evaluation of the role of the IMC in Special Education. When asked about the effect of the IMC on Special Education at the local school district level, 24% felt that the IMC has had some or a great deal of positive effect. Fifteen per cent saw little or no positive effect. Sixty per cent of the respondents chose to give no opinion on this question, perhaps because it requires more time for the effects of a program of this kind to become manifest at the local level. It is noteworthy that there is very little difference between the California and the Wisconsin response on this question.

TABLE 29

(Question 37)

Respondent's evaluation of effect of IMC on Special Education at the local level	N	Percent
Great deal of positive effect	29	5%
Some positive effect	111	19%
Little positive effect	52	9%
No positive effect	36	6%
Overall negative effect	3	0.5%
No opinion	343	60%

When Special Education teachers were asked what was the most important function that a SEIMC could serve, "demonstration of materials" was ranked as first or second by 54% of the sample. "Workshops and in-service training programs" were ranked first or second by 42% of the sample, followed by "evaluation of materials," and "stimulation of production of new materials." Respondents seemed to view "library services" and "information retrieval services" as the least essential functions of a SEIMC (Table 30, Q. 38).

Table 31, Q. 39 gives the teachers' estimate of what is necessary to improve the service and effectiveness of the SEIMC. Of first importance, from the teacher's point of view, is getting instructional materials into the local schools. Next, they feel they need more information on where and how materials are available. Seminars and workshops again get a relatively high ranking.

TABLE 31

(Question 39)

Most needed improvements in service and effectiveness of the IMC	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd
More exhibitions of materials at local schools	32%	16%	48%
Orientation to location and availability of materials	25%	18%	43%
More seminars and workshops	14%	19%	33%
More frequent mailings of available materials	11%	16%	27%
Better methods of borrowing equipment	6%	10%	16%
More varied selection of materials	6%	8%	14%
Video tapes of seminars	3%	7%	10%
Faster return of inquiries	3%	5%	8%

Evaluation of Present Materials and Resources

Another objective of the teacher mail questionnaire survey was to document the present state of the art of educational material in Special Education. This survey represents the first wide-scale data collection of this type in Special Education.

The teachers were asked to list the instructional materials most frequently used in their classrooms and the materials which they had found to be most effective for teaching Special Education students.

The results of these two questions are analyzed as a single category because responses indicate that the teachers were using the materials which they considered to be most effective. In setting up the questionnaire it was anticipated that some of the teachers might be aware of effective material which was not currently available to them. This did not prove to be the case.

Some teachers answered these questions with publisher identification, while others identified material in terms of curriculum classification. The responses were analyzed in both ways.

Curriculum Materials Most Used by Special Education Teachers

Over one-third of the Special Education teachers in both California and Wisconsin checked "textbooks and workbooks" as both most frequently used and most effective.

The use of a wide range of manipulative devices was reported by 13% of the teachers. These devices were frequently referred to as "games," but this category also included "realia," (i.e., cash registers, adding machines, money, etc.).

Audio-visual equipment, including tapes, radio, and records, was the third most frequent response (10%).

The use of films/filmstrips and teacher-made materials both received a 9% frequency count.

All of the following media combined accounted for less than 6% of the total: projectors, programmed instructional material, ditto material, newspapers and magazines, etc.

Commercially Identified Curriculum Material

The results of Q. 14 and 15 in the survey booklet were analyzed in terms of publisher identification. In order to avoid implications of endorsing commercially identified materials, this information is presented in three general categories: (1) mentioned more than 50 times, (2) mentioned between 20 and 50 times, and (3) mentioned 8 to 20 times. The materials within categories are not necessarily listed in order of frequency. A total of 246 teacher responses are included in this analysis.

Category One:

Science Research Associates Kits
Peabody Language Development Kit.

Category Two:

Continental Press, Frostig Visual Perception Materials, Ginn and Company, Lyons & Carnahan. Readers Digest, Turner-Livingston, Scope, Scott-Foresman Company, Steck-Vaughn, Sullivan Programmed Materials.

Category Three:

Follette, Dolch, Language Master, Merrill,
Milton Bradley, My Weekly Reader, Webster.

The names of twelve other commercial companies were cited more than five times and twelve companies were mentioned three or more times. In addition, numerous other trade names appeared less than three times.

There were considerable differences between the two states in terms of commercially identified brand names mentioned. This would substantiate the view that the popularity of educational materials is currently quite heavily dependent on sales promotion efforts by publishing companies which are regionally represented. An example of this is the Sullivan Programmed Materials, produced in California, which were frequently mentioned by California teachers but were not represented on the Wisconsin list. This was true of several of the publishing companies listed above.

Curriculum Materials Most in Need of Improvement

Teachers rated textbooks, workbooks, and programmed instructional materials as the areas in which there was the greatest need for improvement. Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, and games were the next most frequently mentioned categories, followed by educational TV, video tapes, and audio-visual equipment (Table 32, Q. 18).

Subject Areas Most in Need of Improved Instructional Materials

When the categories of greatest and second greatest need for improvement are combined, little distinction is noted between any of the five major subject areas of arithmetic, reading, social sciences, science, home economics, or industrial skills. All of these categories received a combined rating of between 32% and 41% of the responses (Table 33, Q. 17).

Evaluation of Materials Now in Use

Question 16 of the survey booklet asked, "Do you consider that you have the best materials available for use in your classes?" The respondents rated five types of materials as shown below in Table 34, Q. 16, and 8% of them wrote in and rated "Other" materials. They indicate a high degree of satisfaction with their present audio-visual equipment and to somewhat lesser degrees with the film/filmstrips and textbook/workbook materials they now have. It is worth noting that 38% of the respondents reported that programmed instructional materials are not available to them.

TABLE 34

(Question 16)

Teacher evaluation of materials now in use	Adequate or best available		Inadequate		Not Available	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Audio-visual equipment	409	71%	138	24%	28	5%
Films, filmstrips, etc.	387	68%	143	25%	39	7%
Textbooks/workbooks	363	64%	158	28%	48	8%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	321	56%	201	35%	55	10%
Programmed instructional materials	187	33%	168	30%	213	38%
Other	47	8%	17	3%	23	4%

In addition to eliciting the respondent's personal evaluation of the materials he was using, the survey booklet also sought information on formal or official methods of evaluating and approving Special Education materials in the respondent's school system.

TABLE 35

(Question 21)

Present method of evaluating Special Education materials in respondent's school system	N	Percent
No formal approval list	218	38 %
Administrative evaluation	128	22 %
Teachers evaluation committee	85	15 %
State approval list	20	4 %
Don't know	74	13 %
Other (teacher's choice, combination of methods)	54	9 %

With regard to purchase of materials, 12% reported that they were restricted to an approved list; 76% said there was no restriction on their purchases; 12% didn't know (Table 36, Q. 22).

Four questions in the survey booklet were designed to find out where Special Education teachers are now, in fact, getting their information on instructional materials and what sources they consider most important. The two following tables show the results when respondents were asked to "rank the following sources of information about Special Education materials in terms of importance to you as a teacher."

TABLE 37

(Question 20)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Comb. 1st & 2nd	% to whom not avail.
Local workshops and demonstrations	24%	17%	41%	28%
Displays at district or state conventions	17%	17%	34%	15%
Winnower or 5x8 cards or Communicator	17%	14%	31%	16%
Publishers' catalogs	16%	18%	34%	8%
In-service training programs	15%	14%	29%	27%
Journals, newsletters, etc.	12%	20%	32%	5%

TABLE 38

(Question 23)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Comb. 1st & 2nd	% to whom not avail.
Conversations with other teachers	36%	28%	64%	7%
Talks at Special Education teachers meetings	32%	27%	59%	14%
Talks at district or state conventions	11%	16%	27%	15%
Resource or visiting teachers	11%	13%	24%	38%
Talks at local faculty meetings	5%	15%	20%	20%
Other	6%	2%	8%	6%

While there was a fairly wide spread of responses to this question, the teachers tended to give priority to something which would be available to them locally (significantly, 28% also report that local workshops and demonstrations are not available to them). Exchanges with other teachers, especially other Special Education teachers, were considered prime sources of information on Special Education materials.

In an attempt to find out how much Special Education teachers are using certain existing institutional sources of information, respondents were asked to "rate the amount of use you have made of each of the following: ERIC, Regional Labs, local Instructional Materials Center, SEIMC (Wisconsin) or IMCSE (California), university facilities." Results indicate that the respondents had made most use of local Instructional Materials Centers, 61% reporting that they had used them often or occasionally. Just under half had used SEIMC or IMCSE. Least used facilities were ERIC and Regional Labs (Table 39, Q. 24).

The respondent was asked to estimate how well his school resources (school or county library, etc.) met his needs for instructional materials. Local resources were most adequate in meeting teachers' needs for audio-visual equipment and aids (approximately three-fourths expressed satisfaction with locally available material of this type). Local resources were moderately successful in supplying the textbooks/workbooks and manipulative materials the teachers wanted (64% and 49%, respectively, were satisfied with local supplies of these materials). Teachers felt local resources were least able to meet their needs for programmed instructional materials and for educational TV, video tape, etc. (less than one-third found local resources adequate in this regard). (Table 40, Q. 25).

One question asked, "As a teacher in Special Education, which of the following factors do you feel will be most beneficial to you? " with results as shown in Table 41 :

TABLE 41

(Question 19)

Services which would be most beneficial to Special Education teachers	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd
More seminars or workshops on Special Education problems	24%	15%	39%
More materials demonstrations	21%	24%	45%
Better evaluation of materials	17%	16%	33%
Better orientation to location of materials	15%	18%	33%
Improved teacher-training methods	12%	13%	25%
Improved facilities for borrowing equipment	12%	13%	25%

Recently, a Curriculum Materials Information Survey was conducted by the Eastern Regional Institute for Education among 795 teachers from regular education. Some interesting similarities and differences are noted between Special Education and regular education findings.

The ERIE report states, "...most teachers still depend on comfortable print-oriented tools--textbooks, workbooks, and supplementary reading materials--as the backbone of classroom activity." A similar situation seems to obtain in Special Education.

Results from the Special Education Instructional materials survey and the ERIE survey on regular education are so similar in certain respects that the following quotations from the ERIE report are equally applicable to Special Education teachers and administrators:

> "The types of information school people lack or need are exactly those required for buying or using with knowledge, competence and confidence."

> "A large majority of teachers either do not participate in, or are discouraged from participating in, the selection of curriculum materials."

> "The great majority of teachers have insufficient time to seek instructional materials information they want."

> "The great majority of school administrators feel they have inadequate information about newer materials."

On the other hand, there are notable differences between practices in Special Education and practices in regular education in the evaluation of newer materials. The ERIE report states:

> "Among teachers who have used a variety of curriculum materials, there is a significantly higher level of dissatisfaction with newer than older materials."

> "There are major differences among the various subject areas with regard to both satisfaction with, and information about, curriculum materials."

The above statements do not appear to be true in regard to Special Education.

Analysis of Difference Between Wisconsin and California Teacher Mail Questionnaire Survey

A major factor in the organizational structure of the IMC network is the high degree of autonomy assigned to each of the regional centers. Each of the center directors has a great deal of freedom in establishing the policies and procedures to be followed in his region. The rationale for this diversified management structure includes differences in the state educational structures and educational problems which are considered to be somewhat unique to each of the regions.

Appendix B gives the separate tabulation of California and Wisconsin responses. With some exceptions, the differences are relatively minor. As noted earlier, the return rate from Wisconsin was greater. The California teachers were much more heterogeneous with regard to area of teaching; the Wisconsin respondents were nearly all teachers of the mentally retarded.

The teachers from Wisconsin tended to come from smaller school districts, and a greater percentage of them had more years of teaching experience. However, both of the states included a representation of all levels of teaching experience and size of school districts.

Budgetary considerations concerning the purchase of Special Education materials and the degree of administrative support at the local school district level were similar in the California region and in Wisconsin. The same was true of evaluation methods and purchasing procedures.

In both states the teachers placed the greatest emphasis upon the need for materials demonstrations at seminars and workshops. This was followed by a desire for better evaluation methods in the selection of Special Education materials and a better orientation to the location of materials. The lowest rating was given to improved teacher training methods and improved facilities for borrowing equipment.

The California teachers demonstrated a somewhat higher degree of familiarity with the IMC (difference 13%); however, the number of teachers visiting the IMC library was similar in the two states. The teachers in the Wisconsin sample reported a much higher attendance at in-service training conferences than was the case in California. The different terminology used to describe IMC field services may have been a factor here. (See discussion of this, p. 51.)

Interviews with Special Education Teachers

One purpose of the follow-up interviews was to compare the spontaneous responses of the interview situation with the answers teachers had given to the multiple-choice questions of the survey booklet. The comparison showed very few contradictions. On the whole, the information collected in the interviews parallels closely the findings of the mail questionnaire survey. In addition, the interviewers were able to probe further into certain matters, allowing the teachers to expand or illuminate the responses they had given in the survey booklet.

When asked, "What is the most important role that the IMC could play?" both California and Wisconsin teachers indicated that "making materials available for classroom use" and "sponsorship of conferences for exchange of Special Education ideas" were the most desired services. "Field demonstrations" and "evaluations of material" were the next most popular choices. Library services tended to receive the least attention from the teachers.

As in the mail questionnaire, teachers showed a strong (and quite understandable) preference for those services which make instructional materials easily and locally available. They wanted to see and use the materials, preferably use them themselves in their own classrooms, or as the next best thing, see them demonstrated in the "field." Again, in their preference for IMC-sponsored "conferences for exchange of Special Education ideas" is the recurrent theme that teachers could learn much from one another if there were more opportunities for exchange of ideas.

The percentage of respondents who had visited an IMC library was almost identical in the interview survey and the mail survey. The mail survey yielded a general evaluation of the libraries; the interview material enabled the survey team to find out specifically how each teacher had benefited (or why he felt he had not benefited) from the visit. The interviewees who had visited an IMC library felt they had learned most about instructional aids (kits, games, etc.) and reference works (college texts, research and theoretical reports). Some commented that they had never before had a chance to see and try out some of the newer instructional aids. Seeing and trying seemed more helpful than just reading about, as several observations were of this nature: "I could see immediately what I could use." With regard to reference works, the teachers again expressed appreciation for having been introduced to something "new." Some said they had found the reference works from other states or other countries most interesting.

Library visitors found less that was new or interesting to them in the area of textbooks and workbooks for the children. On the whole they felt they were better acquainted with what was available in this area and had somewhat more sophisticated or specialized expectations. The same was true to some extent of audio-visual equipment and aids. Many of the comments on these displays were of the type: "Nothing here was new to me," or "Adequate materials are already in use in our school." Again there was the problem of the teacher with highly specialized needs: "All of these things (i.e., the audio-visual equipment on display) are just too fast for the children I teach." The library's collection of Special Education journals seemed to evoke the least enthusiasm from the teachers. Often they said that they get more of this than they can use at home, or that they are already familiar with most of them.

For the most part, the library visitors seemed to know very little about information retrieval services, e.g., "Didn't see any and don't know exactly what it is," or "Didn't get to that, didn't see it." Among those who do know something about the information retrieval services, many of the remarks reflected a vague feeling that it's a good thing which they ought to know more about: "... know it's there but haven't used it yet" or "... don't know of any teacher who uses it, but we should."

A word of caution about using these comments to judge the relative merits of various library resources or services: The interviews did not supply all the information the survey team would have needed for such a judgment, i.e., such things as the length of time the teacher spent at the library, whether he had guidance, etc. There were statements indicating that the teacher might have found his initial visit more rewarding had he had more time to spend, or more guidance. One teacher remarked, "I need a day of a guided tour."

In addition to library information, teachers who were regular subscribers to publications of the SEIMCs were asked in more detail about their reaction to content of the publications. Both in California and Wisconsin the teachers strongly favored "research reviews" and "evaluation reports" and stressed the need for more articles by teachers about their classroom experiences. It appeared that most of the teachers simply were not interested in the acquisition lists. Apparently there was some confusion on this question in the California interviews, as The Communicator does not carry "research reviews" or "evaluation reports." Nevertheless, a considerable number of California teachers mentioned these as the type of article they found most valuable. It is possible that the descriptions of materials which appear in The Communicator were considered by the teachers to be evaluative.

Scanning individual teacher comments, one can appreciate the difficulty of serving a large, heterogeneous teacher population. Many teachers expressed a desire for more specialization in IMC functions and publications, e.g., "... would like more articles on TMR rather than EMR" or "Not enough of it pertains to my field (the visually handicapped)...."

It is difficult to make any quantitative statements about the value and use of the publications because of this wide range of individual differences among Special Education teachers. There were many instances in which teachers had made intensive use of the material and valued these publications highly, e. g., "I use the materials in my talks before women's groups or in public speaking regarding my work." "I have used ideas in setting up mental health projects." "I have sent for many things in the occupational field."

A number of teachers cited instances of applying ideas from the publications directly in their classroom practices, such as "made a reading device for classroom use," "applied behavior-shaping techniques," "used reading readiness material," "have used many art ideas and projects."

Most of the negative comments concerning the publications reflected the desire for more specialization and application to their immediate classroom situations, e. g., "too low for use with my students (EMRs over 18)," "more articles needed in speech," "it doesn't fit my program," "need more material for TMR."

Several of the teachers suggested that a section of the publication should be devoted to exchange of teacher ideas.

Comments from Wisconsin teachers suggest that it might prove more practical to send publications to Special Education teachers without the need for a yearly renewal of subscription, as is the case with The Winnower. The idea behind this practice was that it probably was not worth sending the publication to a reader who did not demonstrate at least the minimal interest required to fill out and return the renewal form. Many teachers, however, who said that they had found The Winnower very useful did not know about or did not understand the renewal procedure and were wondering why they no longer received the journal.

Teachers who had attended field conferences and demonstrations were asked to comment on the value of them and asked if they had been able to apply any of the ideas or materials in their classrooms. Three out of four of the teachers considered the demonstrations to be of definite value and reported that they had applied ideas in their classrooms. Their comments included: "sent for research on retardation," "ordered some of the books demonstrated," "used workbooks for studying newspapers," "applied art ideas, language art materials, etc."

The teachers who did not consider the demonstrations to be of value stated that they were already familiar with the materials which were demonstrated or that the materials did not relate to their particular student population or area of specialization.

Recommendations for improving materials demonstrations yielded a wide variety of responses including "longer meetings with more time for discussion," "more displays of material," "more emphasis on how to use the materials in the classroom," "smaller demonstrations," "more material for nursery age children," "more teaching machines."

Interviews with Non-Respondents

Members of the survey team interviewed 47 teachers in California and Wisconsin who had not returned the original survey form. These teachers were asked to fill out the survey form in the presence of the interviewer, so all the basic data collected from respondents was also collected from non-respondents, making possible a comparison of respondent-non-respondent characteristics. This comparison revealed very few differences between non-respondents and the 588 teachers who had returned their completed survey booklets by mail.

Seventy-eight percent (78%) of the non-respondents (as compared to 75% of the respondents) were teaching the retarded. Over 90% of the non-respondents are certified in Special Education, as compared to the 79% of the respondents who are certified. Respondents in general had had a few more years of full-time teaching experience, but non-respondents and respondents were similar in the number of years teaching Special Education subjects (63% and 64%, respectively, had had over four years experience in Special Education).

Non-respondents seemed as satisfied as respondents with the degree of support given to Special Education by their local school administrations and by their principals. Even more non-respondents, in fact, than respondents felt that Special Education was more strongly supported in their district than regular education. As in the respondent population, there were few complaints from non-respondents about budgetary limitations on purchasing materials.

A smaller percentage of the non-respondents were familiar with the IMC than in the major sample; however, a higher percentage of the non-respondents (40%) told the interviewers that they had visited an IMC library.

Familiarity with publications, attendance at conferences, and use of other services were similar in the two samples. Fewer non-respondents had requested bibliographic searches, and their attendance at conferences at an IMC was a few percentage points below that of the respondents; but the non-respondent evaluation of those services they had used did not differ markedly from that of the general mail survey population.

Interviews with Special Education Administrators

During October 1967, in-depth interviews were held with 44 Special Education administrators. Most of these interviews were conducted during a one-week Special Education Conference held at Sacramento, California. The interview data was gathered by three members of the evaluation team with the project director conducting most of the interviews.

Nearly all of the interviewees were at the master's degree level, many of them having additional work beyond the master's degree. Three individuals held a Ph. D. and two individuals, a bachelor's degree. Approximately 80% of them were coordinators or directors of Special Education programs at the local district level. The remainder were school principals.

The sample was representative of small rural school districts (districts with less than 5 Special Education teachers), moderately large school districts (6-40 Special Education teachers), and large districts (over 40 Special Education teachers).

Ninety percent (90%) of the administrators had some familiarity with the Special Education Instructional Materials Centers, and approximately one-third of them had had some direct contact with the services sponsored by centers. Very few had visited a Special Education Instructional Materials Center personally or had made direct use of the library facilities; however, nearly all of them were familiar with at least one of the SEIMC publications and approximately one-half of the sample had attended conferences sponsored by the SEIMC, in addition to the conference they were presently attending.

In both California and Wisconsin, the overall effectiveness of the regional Special Education Instructional Materials Centers is generally correlated with the distance from the Center, that is, both SEIMCs have had relatively little effect on the northernmost districts of their respective states. The administrators who have had considerable contact with the IMC services (generally within a 50-mile radius of the Center) spoke very highly of the staff and considered the programs to be a very valuable resource.

In general, those who were not familiar with the details of particular services expressed the feeling that it was their own lack of initiative in taking advantage of these services which accounted for their lack of use rather than a reflection on the quality of the services.

Nearly half of the sample stated that teachers from their district had made some use of the IMC services, including 40% who reported visits to the IMC by members of their teaching staff.

In California the primary communication link with the field is the publication, The Communicator. Nearly all of the administrators were familiar with The Communicator. The majority of them viewed this publication as a general newsletter to be scanned for items of interest and an excellent source for keeping up with recent developments in Special Education. An estimated 25% read it extensively, about half of these reporting that they had used it as a topic in their teachers' conferences and that ideas from this publication had been applied in classroom teaching. In general, the administrators were much less familiar with the publication, 5 x 8, and viewed it as material which was much more directly relevant to the classroom teacher. Nearly all of those who were familiar with the 5 x 8 stated that their teachers found it a most worthwhile resource.

Only a small percentage of the administrators interviewed had attended a materials demonstration sponsored by the Special Education Instructional Materials Centers. As is the case with the other services, those who had attended a field demonstration felt that it contributed much to their teachers. The administrators in Wisconsin who had attended a one- or two-day in-service workshop sponsored by the IMC in that region spoke of these conferences in laudatory terms.

Several interviewees in California mentioned that demonstrations were scheduled for their area later in the school year, and nearly all of the administrators were interested in having a field service unit make a presentation to their teachers. The California IMC has recently expanded its field services to include three field demonstration teams, as requests for services are continually increasing. Within the year it is anticipated that requests will greatly exceed the IMC's ability to fulfill these requests.

Only three of the interviewees reported making direct use of information retrieval services. One of these considered it to be the most important function of the IMC.

When asked, "What do you feel is the most important role for the SEIMC to perform?" the administrators, as might be expected, gave a wide range of generalized responses. The broad category of "disseminating information about available Special Education materials" was mentioned most frequently. The more specific responses centered around "materials demonstration" and "evaluation of materials." As one administrator phrased it, 'Demonstrations are most important as far as the teachers are concerned; however, the administrative personnel are most interested in evaluation."

In commenting on the adequacy of their local material resources and availability of funds for purchase of Special Education material, many of the administrators noted that these situations have improved considerably over the past three years. Approximately two-thirds of the interviewees felt that their local material resources were adequate, and over 80% felt that they had adequate funds to buy most of the Special Education materials which their teachers felt were essential. Several administrators noted that this changing situation is largely due to the Federal Assistance programs in Special Education.

The above situation did not, however, pertain to all school districts. At least one-third of the administrators felt their material resources were very meager and several felt that their materials budget in Special Education was highly inadequate. This would suggest that the services of the Special Education IMCs should be directed toward such school districts rather than divided equally throughout the region.

It should be noted that the above statements relate to "perceived needs" and do not necessarily represent an accurate comparative statement of the status of resource availability in Special Education. There was a wide range of interest and sophistication in educational materials among administrators. Some of them demonstrated an excellent knowledge of the most recent developments in Special Education materials, whereas others were unable to specify any of the materials which were currently in use in their district.

At the present time , commercial suppliers (salesmen or catalogs) appear to be a major source of information on new materials. One-third of the interviewees mentioned commercial sources as their primary communication channel; conferences and journals were mentioned by another third; the remaining third listed a wide variety of other sources.

In reviewing over 100 pages of interview data, the subject of evaluation accounted for more discussion than any other subject area. The overwhelming majority of school districts included in the survey have no local evaluation procedures or very informal procedures at best. In most cases, the evaluations are based upon the individual teacher's judgment or the judgment of the coordinator of Special Education. Typical responses were:

> "I evaluate materials in my district and transfer the information by personal contact to the teachers."
>
> "Information is a problem. There is almost too much money to spend and not enough time to properly evaluate and find out what materials are available."
>
> "The major problem in selection of materials by teachers is that they use the catalog and tend to order everything in the catalog, and then when they get the materials feel that it is not what they thought it was and very often the materials are not used."
>
> "Frequently my teachers will put an order in for 18 copies of one particular type of workbook or textbook, and I do not approve these orders because this indicates that the teachers are not teaching to individual differences."
>
> "Our biggest problem is that we do not know what we need."
>
> "I would not think of buying anything that the teachers did not feel a need for or if they felt that it would not be used in their classroom."

When asked for their opinion on the best evaluation procedure, the administrators were quick to respond that teachers must play a direct role in evaluation rather than have it centered on an administrative or state level. The reason for this is not based upon the view that teachers' judgments are necessarily the best source, but teachers tend to use only those materials which they have personally selected. The interviews with the teachers themselves strongly supported this view.

In the course of conducting these interviews, the project director made an attempt to identify the primary change-agent in the selection and use of instructional materials in Special Education. As the interviews progressed, it became increasingly evident that the key person for effecting change in classroom practices is the person in a supervisory or consulting role who comes in frequent and direct contact with the classroom teacher. This person is not necessarily the director or coordinator of Special Education; more typically, he is among the support personnel on the director's staff--an assistant director, resource teacher or supervising teacher. In some cases the school principal may fulfill this role.

Exactly who the change-agent is in a particular school district is an individual situation and highly dependent upon the administrative structure of the district. In cases where the director or coordinator of Special Education has no support personnel, he is frequently so engulfed in administrative detail and responsibilities that he loses touch with the classroom situation. On the other hand, most teachers readily admit that they are so busy with the demands of their daily classroom situations, they do not have time to learn about and apply new materials and techniques.

APPENDIX A

Tables

(Total Response)

APPENDIX A

TABLE 3

Summary of Returns to Mail Survey

	WISCONSIN	CALIFORNIA	TOTAL
Total in original mailing	693	1099	1792
Less: Returned as Unknown	2	26	28
Less: Claimed not to teach Special Education	1	5	6
Less: Refused to answer	1	1	2
Adjusted Base of Returns	689	1067	1756
Total Returned	314	274	588
Percent of Adjusted Base	(45.6%)	(25.7%)	(33.5%)
Total Returned with no "Other" form	84	63	147
Percent of Total Returned	(26.8%)	(23.0%)	(25.0%)
Total Returned with Completion Problems*	60	26	86
Percent of Total Returned	(19.1%)	(9.5%)	(14.6%)
Number of Permit Return Mailed - Adjusted	50	44	94
Number of Permit Return Received	17	12	29
Percent Permit Mailed Returned	(34.0%)	(27.3%)	(30.9%)
Number of Non-Permit Return Mailed - Adjusted	639	1023	1662
Number of Non-Permit Return Received	297	262	559
Percent Non-Permit Mailed Returned	(46.5%)	(25.6%)	(33.6%)
Number California with State Cover Letter Mailed		276	
Number with State Cover Letter Returned		55	
Percent with Cover Letter Returned		(19.9%)	
Number California with No State Cover Letter Mailed		791	
Number with No State Cover Letter Returned		219	
Percent with No Cover Letter Returned		(27.7%)	

* "Completion Problems" means that the answer sheet was completed in ink, answers were not put on the answer sheet, used checks and x's rather than actual marks, etc.

RESPONSES TO MAIL SURVEY

The order of the tabular information given here does not necessarily coincide with the order of the survey booklet. In the survey booklet, questions relating to the Special Education Instructional Materials Centers were placed in the last section in order not to influence answers concerning evaluation of present materials and resources. The question number given for each table below refers to the question number in the survey booklet (see Appendix D for samples of the survey booklet). There are no tables in this Appendix for questions 14 and 15, which required respondents to write in the names of materials used most often and/or found most effective. These responses were handled differently, as discussed on pages 54 and 55.

In some questions, respondents were asked to rank several items in order of importance to them as teachers or to evaluate relative need for improvement in several areas. Tables show percentage of first or second choices given to each item, with a combined figure indicating first and second choices where this seemed more meaningful than first choice alone.

Characteristics of the Respondents:

TABLE 4

(Question 1)

Areas of teaching specialty	N	Percent
Educable mentally retarded	365	62%
Trainable mentally retarded	65	11%
Speech/Blind/Deaf	58	10%
Emotionally disturbed	21	4%
Children with learning disability	16	3%
Physically handicapped	8	1%
Other	48	9%

Characteristics of the Respondents (Continued):

TABLE 5

(Question 3)

Years of full-time teaching	N	Percent
More than 16 years	196	34%
9-15 years	163	30%
5-8 years	102	18%
2-4 years	92	16%
0-1 years	31	5%

TABLE 6

(Question 4)

Years teaching Special Education subjects	N	Percent
5 or more years	319	54%
4 years	61	10%
3 years	70	12%
2 years	81	14%
0-1 years	56	10%

TABLE 7

(Question 5)

Years teaching in state where now teaching	N	Percent
3 or more years	516	88%
2 years	20	3%
Starting 2nd year	29	5%
This is first year	23	4%

Characteristics of the Respondents (Continued):

TABLE 8

(Question 6)

Amount of training in Special Education	N	Percent
Certified in Special Education with extra coursework beyond certification	353	60%
Certified in Special Education	110	19%
Working toward certification	78	13%
Not working toward certification, but have taken one or more courses in Special Education	30	5%
No Special Education training	13	2%

TABLE 9

(Question 2)

Age level of children taught	N	Percent
Under 10 years	200	34%
11-16 years	294	50%
Over 16 years	94	16%

TABLE 10

(Question 13)

Number of classes for handicapped children taught in school where respondent principally teaches	N	Percent
1 class	140	24%
2-5 classes	272	47%
6 or more classes	138	24%
Other	26	5%

Characteristics of Respondents' School Districts (as perceived by respondents):

TABLE 11

(Question 7)

Approximate number of Special Education teachers in County or school district	N	Percent
20 or less	291	51%
21-40	91	16%
41-60	35	6%
61-100	33	6%
Over 100	121	21%

TABLE 12

(Question 8)

Relative strength of support given to Special Education program by county or school district administration	N	Percent
Equal to regular education	349	60%
Weaker support than regular education	183	31%
Stronger support than regular education	52	9%

TABLE 13

(Question 9)

Relative strength of support given to Special Education program by school principal	N	Percent
Equal to regular education	376	65%
Weaker support than regular education	125	22%
Stronger support than regular education	76	13%

Characteristics of Respondents' School Districts (as perceived by respondents)(Continued):

TABLE 14

(Question 10)

Extent to which school budget allows teacher to purchase regular classroom materials	N	Percent
Over 90% of materials needed	260	45%
80-90& of materials needed	122	21%
60-80% of materials needed	119	21%
Less than 50%	76	13%

TABLE 15

(Question 11)

Extent to which school budget allows teacher to purchase supplementary materials	N	Percent
Over 90% of materials needed	188	33%
80-90% of materials needed	147	25%
60-80% of materials needed	116	20%
Less than 50% of materials needed	128	22%

Characteristics of Respondents' School Districts (as perceived by respondents) (Continued):

TABLE 16

(Question 12)

Organization under which respondent teaches Special Education classes:	N	Percent
Assigned to one school and teaches there	516	89%
Works from central office and serves a network of schools	26	5%
Assigned to several schools	17	3%
Assigned to one school and teaches at several schools	7	1%
Other	13	2%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services:

TABLE 17

(Question 26)

Extent of acquaintance with purposes and programs of IMC (SEIMC in Wisconsin or IMCSE in California)	N	Percent
Never heard of it	46	8%
Know very little about it	153	26%
Know something about it	308	53%
Know a great deal about it	74	13%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 18

(Question 27)

Source of information about the IMC	N	Percent
Supervisors or Director	149	28%
Representative from IMC	139	26%
Other teachers	93	17%
Other (Meetings, publications, schools and universities, talks at conferences, etc.)	161	30%

TABLE 19

(Question 28)

Visits to the IMC Library	N	Percent
Has never visited	430	74%
Visited once	67	12%
Visited one or more times and used services	82	14%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 20

(Question 29)

Main reasons for not using library resources	N	Percent
Doesn't know enough about it	139	27%
Other groups do as well in providing materials	15	3%
Not enough time to incorporate IMC into schedule	57	11%
Too far away to use effectively	227	44%
Other (Center new, new teacher, hours or operating conditions at Center)	50	10%
Not applicable	29	6%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 21

(Question 30)

Respondent's evaluation of IMC publications (refers to The Winnower for Wisconsin, 5 x 8 for California)	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
Never received it	56	18%	48	18%
Finds it to be of general interest only	84	27%	45	17%
Finds it to be of some value in teaching	112	36%	95	36%
Finds it to be very valuable and has applied several ideas in classroom	58	19%	75	29%

TABLE 22

(Question 31-W)

W-Wisconsin - Items found most valuable in The Winnower	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent
Articles	101	40%
Materials evaluation	78	31%
Research reviews	44	17%
Acquisitions list	31	12%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 23

(Question 31-C)

C - California - Value of The IMCSE Communicator to respondents	California N	California Percent
Never received it	104	40%
Of general interest only	64	24%
Of some value in teaching	73	28%
Very valuable and has applied several ideas	22	8%

TABLE 24

(Question 32)

Attendance at In-Service Training Conference (Wisconsin) or SEE Conference (California)	N	Percent
Never heard of them	281	49%
Heard of them, never attended	132	23%
Attended one conference, found it to be of general interest	38	7%
Attended one conference, found it to be of considerable value	62	11%
Attended more than one conference	65	11%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 25

(Question 33)

Attendance at materials display exhibit	N	Percent
No, has never attended	374	65%
Yes, found it of some general interest	92	16%
Yes, found it to be valuable	112	19%

TABLE 26

(Question 35)

Attendance at workshop, institute or conference at IMC	N	Percent
Never heard of them	259	45%
Heard of them, but never attended	257	45%
Yes, found them to be of value	52	9%
Yes, found them to be very valuable	7	1%
Yes, considered them to be of little value	3	.5%

TABLE 27

(Question 36)

Attendance at field demonstration of materials	N	Percent
Never heard of them	303	53%
Heard of them, but have never seen one	175	31%
Yes, considered them to be of little value	25	4%
Yes, found them to be of value	47	8%
Yes, found them to be of considerable value	21	4%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 28

(Question 34)

Requests for bibliography search	N	Percent
No, has never requested search	516	89%
Yes, once	51	9%
Yes, more than once	12	2%

TABLE 29

(Question 37)

Effect of the IMC on Special Education at the local level	N	Percent
No opinion	343	60%
Overall negative effect	3	.5%
No positive effect	36	6%
Little positive effect	52	9%
Some positive effect	111	19%
Great deal of positive effect	29	5%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 30*

(Question 38)

Most important functions an IMC can serve for Special Education teachers	% of first choices	% of second choices	Combined 1st & 2nd
Demonstration of materials	22%	31%	54%
Workshops and in-service training	23%	19%	42%
Stimulation of production of new materials	19%	13%	32%
Evaluation of materials	18%	18%	36%
Library services	12%	10%	22%
Information retrieval systems	6%	10%	16%

TABLE 31

(Question 39)

Most needed improvements in service and effectiveness of the IMC	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd
More exhibitions of materials at local schools	32%	16%	48%
Orientation to location and availability of materials	25%	18%	43%
More seminars and workshops	14%	19%	33%
More frequent mailings of available material	11%	16%	27%
Better methods of borrowing equipment	6%	10%	16%
More varied selection of materials	6%	8%	14%
Video tapes of seminars	3%	7%	10%
Faster return of inquiries	3%	5%	8%

*Where respondents were asked to rank several items in order of importance or need, percentages should be interpreted as the percentage of first (or second) choices given to each item, not as a percentage of respondents. Sometimes respondents marked more than one "first" choice, or failed to rank all items, etc.

Evaluation of Materials and Resources

TABLE 32

(Question 18)

Types of curriculum materials in which there is greatest need for improvement:	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd
Textbooks/workbooks	39%	14%	53%
Programmed instructional materials	21%	31%	52%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	17%	23%	40%
Educational TV, video tapes, etc.	14%	17%	31%
Audio-visual equipment	5%	14%	19%
Other	4%	1%	5%

TABLE 33

(Question 17)

Subject areas in which teachers see greatest need for improvement:	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd
Reading	25%	14%	39%
Home Economics or Industrial Skills	18%	14%	32%
Arithmetic	16%	25%	41%
Social Studies	16%	23%	39%
Science	15%	21%	36%
Other	9%	3%	12%

TABLE 34

(Question 16)

Teacher evaluation of materials now in use:	Adequate or best Available		Inadequate		Not Available	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Audio-Visual equipment	409	71%	138	24%	28	5%
Films, filmstrips, etc.	387	68%	143	25%	39	7%
Textbooks/workbooks	363	64%	158	28%	48	8%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	321	56%	201	35%	55	10%
Programmed instruction materials	187	33%	168	30%	213	38%
Other	47	8%	17	3%	23	4%

TABLE 35

(Question 21)

Present method of evaluating special education materials in respondent's school system:	N	Percent
No formal approval list	218	38%
Administrative Evaluation	128	22%
Teachers evaluation committee	85	15%
State approval list	20	4%
Don't know	74	13%
Other (teacher's choice, combination of methods)	54	9%

TABLE 36

(Question 22)

Purchases of Special Education materials restricted to an approved list:	N	Percent
No	442	76%
Yes	71	12%
Don't Know	69	12%

TABLE 37

(Question 20)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials:	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd	%to whom not avail.
Local workshops and demonstrations	24%	17%	41%	28%
Displays at district or state conventions	17%	17%	34%	15%
Winnower or 5 x 8 cards or Communicator	17%	14%	31%	16%
Publishers' catalogs	16%	18%	34%	8%
In-service training programs	15%	14%	29%	27%
Journals, newsletters, etc.	12%	20%	32%	5%

TABLE 38

(Question 23)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials:	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd	%to whom not avail.
Conversation with other teachers	36%	28%	64%	7%
Talks at Special Ed. Teachers meetings	32%	27%	59%	14%
Talks at district or state conventions	11%	16%	27%	15%
Resource or visiting teachers	11%	13%	24%	38%
Talks at local faculty meetings	5%	15%	20%	20%
Other	6%	2%	8%	6%

TABLE 39

(Question 24)

Amount of use made of each of institutional sources of information	N	Used Occasionally or often Percent	N	Never heard of or used Percent
Local Instructional Materials Center	344	61%	214	38%
University Facilities	310	55%	248	44%
SEIMC or IMCSE	263	47%	300	54%
ERIC (Educational Resources Information Center)	72	12%	495	87%
Regional Labs	59	11%	495	89%
Other	55	9%	24	4%

TABLE 40

(Question 25)

Extent to which local resources (school county library, etc.) meet respondent's needs for instructional materials	Satisfactory		Not Available or Unsatisfactory	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Audio-visual equipment	447	78%	125	22%
Audio-visual aids	395	69%	173	30%
Textbooks /workbooks	370	64%	201	36%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	281	49%	290	51%
Programmed instruction materials	176	31%	388	69%
Educational TV, video tapes, etc.	149	28%	393	72%

TABLE 41

(Question 19)

Services which would be most beneficial to Special Education Teachers:	% of 1st choices	% of 2nd choices	Combined 1st & 2nd
More seminars or workshops on special education problems	24%	15%	39%
More materials demonstration	21%	24%	45%
Better evaluation of materials	17%	16%	33%
Better orientation to location of materials	15%	18%	33%
Improved teacher-training methods	12%	13%	25%
Improved facilities for borrowing equipment	12%	13%	25%

APPENDIX B

Tables

(California and Wisconsin Responses Separated)

APPENDIX B

CALIFORNIA AND WISCONSIN RESPONSES TO MAIL SURVEY

In this Appendix the separate California and Wisconsin responses to the mail survey questionnaire are given in tabular form. The tables begin with TABLE 4 in order to have the table numbers in this Appendix correspond to the table numbers in Appendix A. (Tables 1, 2 and 3 do not deal with answers to the mail survey questions.)

The order of the tabular information given here does not necessarily coincide with the order of the survey booklet. In the survey booklet, questions relating to the Special Education Instructional Materials Centers were placed in the last section in order not to influence answers concerning evaluation of present materials and resources. The question number given for each table below refers to the question number in the survey booklet. (See Appendix D for a sample of the survey booklet.)

Characteristics of the Respondents:

TABLE 4

(Question 1)

	Wisconsin		California	
Areas of teaching specialty	N	Percent	N	Percent
Trainable mentally retarded	30	10%	35	13%
Educable mentally retarded	259	82%	106	39%
Both EMR and TMR	8	3%	6	2%
Slow Learner	5	2%	2	1%
Physically handicapped	0	0%	8	3%
Speech/Deaf/Blind	1		57	20%
Emotionally disturbed	3	1%	18	7%
Specific learning disability	1		15	5%
Other	7	2%	26	10%

Characteristics of the Respondents (continued):

TABLE 5

(Question 3)

Years of full time teaching	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
0-1	13	4%	18	7%
2-4	36	12%	56	21%
5-8	42	13%	60	22%
9-15	79	25%	84	31%
16 or more	142	46%	54	20%

TABLE 6

(Question 4)

Years teaching Special Education subjects	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
0-1	15	5%	41	15%
2 years	36	11%	45	16%
3 years	34	11%	36	13%
4 years	31	10%	30	11%
5 or more years	197	63%	122	45%

Characteristics of the Respondents (continued):

TABLE 7

(Question 5)

Years teaching in state where now teaching	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
3 or more years	289	92%	227	83%
2 years	4	1%	16	6%
Starting 2nd year	14	5%	15	5%
This is first year	7	2%	16	6%

TABLE 8

(Question 6)

Amount of training in Special Education	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Certified in Special Education with extra coursework beyond certification	181	58%	172	64%
Certified in Special Education	85	27%	25	9%
Working toward certification	39	12%	39	14%
Not working toward certification but has taken one or more courses in Special Education	5	2%	25	9%
No Special Education training	3	1%	10	4%

Characteristics of the Respondents (continued):

TABLE 9

(Question 2)

Age level of children taught	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
Under 7 years	3	1%	14	5%
7-10 years	54	18%	66	25%
11-13 years	53	17%	44	16%
14-16 years	31	10%	30	11%
Over 16 years	38	13%	10	4%
Other (some combination of above)	124	41%	105	39%

TABLE 10

(Question 13)

Number of classes for handicapped children taught in schools where respondent principally teaches	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
One class	104	33%	36	14%
2-5 classes	143	46%	129	49%
6 or more classes	60	19%	78	30%
Other	5	2%	21	8%

Characteristics of Respondents' School Districts (as perceived by respondents):

TABLE 11

(Question 7)

Approximate number of Special Education teachers in County or School District	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
20 or less	188	62%	103	38%
21-40	41	13%	50	19%
41-60	11	4%	24	9%
61-100	15	5%	18	7%
over 100	49	16%	72	27%

TABLE 12

(Question 8)

Relative strength of support given to Special Education program by County or School District Administration	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Stronger support than regular education	23	7%	29	11%
Equal to regular education	189	60%	160	59%
Weaker support than regular education	100	32%	83	30%

Characteristics of Respondents' School Districts (as perceived by respondents) (continued):

TABLE 13

(Question 9)

Relative strength of support given to Special Education program by school principal	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Stronger support than regular education	28	9%	48	18%
Equal to regular education	221	71%	155	58%
Weaker support than regular education	62	20%	63	24%

TABLE 14

(Question 10)

Extent to which schoold budget allows teacher to purchase regular classroom materials	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Over 90 percent of materials needed	154	50%	106	39%
80-90 percent of materials needed	69	22%	53	20%
60-80 percent of materials n needed	60	20%	59	22%
Less than 50 percent of materials needed	24	8%	52	19%

Characteristics of Respondents' School Districts (as perceived by respondents) (continued):

TABLE 15

(Question 11)

Extent to which school budget allows teacher to purchase supplementary materials	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
Over 90 percent of materials needed	120	38%	68	25%
80-90 percent of materials needed	83	27%	64	24%
60-80 percent of materials needed	64	21%	52	19%
Less than 50 percent of materials needed	42	14%	86	32%

TABLE 16

(Question 12)

Organization under which respondent teaches Special Education classes:	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
Assigned to one school and teaches there	300	97%	216	80%
Works from central office and serves a network of schools	2	1%	6	2%
Assigned to several schools	1	.3%	16	6%
Assigned to one school and teaches at several schools	1	.3%	24	9%
Other	5	2%	8	3%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services:

TABLE 17

(Question 26)

Extent of acquaintance with purposes and programs of IMC (SEIMC in Wisconsin or IMCSE in California)	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Never heard of it	30	10%	16	6%
Knows very little about it	95	30%	58	22%
Knows something about it	147	47%	161	60%
Knows a great deal about it	40	13%	34	13%

TABLE 18

(Question 27)

Source of Information about the IMC	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Other teachers	60	21%	33	13%
Supervisors or Director	74	26%	75	30%
Representative from IMC	80	28%	59	23%
Other (meetings, publications, schools and universities, talks at conferences, etc.)	76	26%	85	34%

TABLE 19

(Question 28)

Visits to the IMC Library	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Has never visited	227	73%	203	75%
Visited once	35	11%	32	12%
Visited one or more times and used services	48	16%	34	13%

TABLE 20

(Question 29)

Main reasons for not using library resources	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Doesn't know enough about it	75	27%	64	27%
Other groups do as well in providing materials	11	4%	4	2%
Not enough time to incorporate IMC into schedule	22	8%	35	15%
Too far away to use effectively	139	49%	88	37%
Other (Center new, new teacher, hours or operating conditions at Center)	22	8%	28	12%
Not applicable	12	4%	17	7%

TABLE 21

(Question 30)

Respondent's evaluation of IMC publications (refers to The Winnower--for Wisconsin, 5 x 8 for California)	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Never received it	56	18%	48	18%
Finds it to be of general interest only	84	27%	45	17%
Finds it to be of some value in teaching	112	36%	95	36%
Finds it to be very valuable and has applied several ideas in classroom	58	19%	75	29%

TABLE 22

(Question 31-W)

Items found most valuable in The Winnower (Wisconsin respondents only)	Wisconsin	
	N	Percent
Articles	101	40%
Materials evaluation	78	31%
Research reviews	44	17%
Acquisitions list	31	12%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 23

(Question 31-C)

Value of the IMCSE Communicator (California respondents only)	California	
	N	Percent
Never received it	104	40%
Finds it of general interest only	64	24%
Finds it of some value in teaching	73	28%
Finds it very valuable and has applied several ideas	22	8%

TABLE 24

(Question 32)

Attendance at In-Service Training Conference (Wisconsin) or SEE Conference (California)	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Never heard of them	78	25%	203	76%
Heard of them, never attended	77	25%	55	21%
Attended one conference, found it to be of general interest	34	11%	4	1%
Attended one conference, found it to be of considerable value	57	18%	5	2%
Attended more than one conference	64	21%	1	.4%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued)

TABLE 25
(Question 33)

Attendance at materials display exhibit sponsored by SEIMC	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
No, has never attended	177	57%	197	74%
Yes, found it of some general interest	65	21%	27	10%
Yes, found it to be valuable	69	22%	43	16%

TABLE 26

(Question 35)

Attendance at workshop, institute or conference at SEIMC	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Never heard of them	119	38%	140	52%
Heard of them, but never attended	145	47%	112	42%
Yes, considered them to be of little value	2	1%	1	1%
Yes, found them to be of value	41	13%	11	4%
Yes, found them to be of considerable value	3	1%	4	2%

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued)

TABLE 27

(Question 36)

Attendance at field demonstration of materials	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Never heard of them	154	50%	149	56%
Heard of them, but have never seen one	91	30%	84	32%
Yes, considered them to be of little value	15	5%	10	4%
Yes, found them to be of value	28	9%	19	7%
Yes, found them to be of considerable value	17	6%	4	1%

TABLE 28

(Question 34)

Requests for bibliography search	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
No, has never requested search	286	92%	230	86%
Yes, once	18	6%	33	12%
Yes, more than once	7	2%	5	2%

TABLE 29

(Question 37)

Effect of the IMC on Special Education at the local level	Wisconsin N	Wisconsin Percent	California N	California Percent
No opinion	183	59%	160	60%
Overall negative effect	1	.3%	2	1%
No positive effect	21	7%	15	6%
Little positive effect	33	11%	19	7%
Some positive effect	58	19%	53	20%
A great deal of positive effect	12	4%	17	6%

TABLE 30*

(Question 38)

Most important functions an IMC can serve for Special Education teachers	Wisconsin % of first choices	Wisconsin % of second choices	California % of first choices	California % of second choices
Library services	14%	10%	10%	9%
Information retrieval systems	1%	7%	11%	13%
Evaluation of materials	19%	18%	17%	18%
Demonstration of materials	24%	34%	21%	27%
Workshops and in-service training	25%	18%	20%	19%
Stimulation of the production of new materials	16%	12%	21%	15%

* Where respondents were asked to rank several items in order of importance or need, percentages should be interpreted as the percentage of first (or second) choices given to each item, not as a percentage of respondents. A few respondents marked more than one "first" choice, or failed to rank all items, etc.

Knowledge and Use of IMC Services (Continued):

TABLE 31

(Question 39)

Most needed improvements in service and effectiveness of the IMC	Wisconsin		California	
	% of first choices	% of second choices	% of first choices	% of second choices
More exhibitions of materials at local schools	34%	15%	29%	18%
Orientation to location and availability of materials	25%	19%	24%	18%
More seminars and workshops	14%	19%	14%	20%
More frequent mailings of available materials	10%	20%	12%	13%
Better methods of borrowing equipment	6%	11%	7%	10%
More varied selection of materials	6%	7%	6%	8%
Video tapes of seminars	2%	6%	4%	8%
Faster return of inquiries	2%	3%	4%	6%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources

TABLE 32

(Question 18)

Types of curriculum materials in which there is greatest need for improvement	Wisconsin		California	
	% of first choices	% of second choices	% of first choices	% of second choices
Textbooks/workbooks	40%	14%	38%	14%
Programmed instructional materials	20%	31%	22%	30%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	16%	22%	19%	25%
Educational TV, video tapes, etc.	17%	18%	12%	16%
Audio-visual equipment	7%	15%	4%	13%
Other	1%	1%	6%	1%

TABLE 33

(Question 17)

Subject areas in which teachers see greatest need for improvement	Wisconsin		California	
	% of first choices	% of second choices	% of first choices	% of second choices
Reading	20%	13%	32%	15%
Home Economics or Industrial Skills	21%	15%	15%	13%
Arithmetic	16%	19%	15%	32%
Social Studies	17%	27%	15%	19%
Science	19%	23%	10%	19%
Other	6%	2%	13%	3%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources (Continued):

TABLE 34 - Wisconsin

(Question 16)

Teacher evaluation of material now in use:	Wisconsin					
	Adequate or Best Available		Inadequate		Not Available	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Textbooks/workbooks	220	72%	65	21%	22	7%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	185	60%	106	34%	19	6%
Programmed instructional materials	105	34%	103	33%	100	32%
Audio-visual equipment	228	74%	66	21%	14	5%
Films, filmstrips, etc.	213	69%	78	25%	17	6%

TABLE 34 - California

(Question 16)

Teacher evaluation of materials now in use:	California					
	Adequate or Best Available		Inadequate		Not Available	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Textbooks/workbooks	143	55%	93	35%	26	10%
Manipulative materials, readymade kits, games, etc.	136	51%	95	36%	36	13%
Programmed instructional materials	82	32%	65	25%	113	43%
Audio-visual equipment	181	68%	72	27%	14	5%
Films, filmstrips, etc.	174	66%	65	25%	22	8%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources (Continued):

TABLE 35

(Question 21)

Present method of evaluating Special Education materials in respondent's school system	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Teachers' evaluation committee	47	15%	38	14%
Administrative evaluation	72	23%	56	21%
State approval list	11	4%	9	3%
No formal approval list	125	40%	93	35%
Don't know	30	10%	44	16%
Other	26	8%	28	10%

TABLE 36

(Question 22)

Purchases of Special Education materials restricted to an approved list	Wisconsin		California	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Yes	32	10%	39	14%
No	250	80%	192	71%
Don't know	31	10%	38	14%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources (Continued):

TABLE 37 - Wisconsin

(Question 20)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	Wisconsin % of first choices	Wisconsin % of second choices	Wisconsin % to whom not available
Displays at district or state conventions	21%	23%	8%
Local workshops and demonstrations	21%	17%	32%
Publishers' catalogues	19%	21%	7%
Journals, newsletters, etc.	10%	19%	3%
The Winnower	15%	11%	14%
In-service training programs	13%	10%	26%

TABLE 37 - California

(Question 20)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	California % of first choices	California % of second choices	California % to whom not available
Displays at district or state conventions	11%	12%	22%
Local workshops and demonstrations	27%	17%	22%
Publishers' catalogues	13%	16%	8%
Journals, newsletters, etc.	14%	21%	7%
5 x 8 or Communicator	18%	17%	18%
In-service training programs	16%	18%	24%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources (Continued):

TABLE 38 - Wisconsin

(Question 23)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	Wisconsin		
	% of first choices	% of second choices	% to whom not available
Talks at district or state conventions	12%	17%	5%
Talks at local faculty meetings	3%	13%	20%
Talks at Special Education teachers' meetings	35%	27%	14%
Resource or visiting teacher	11%	14%	32%
Conversations with other teachers	34%	27%	7%
Other	5%	2%	7%

TABLE 38 - California

(Question 23)

Most important sources of information about Special Education materials	California		
	% of first choices	% of second choices	% to whom not available
Talks at district or state conventions	10%	15%	24%
Talks at local faculty meetings	7%	17%	18%
Talks at Special Education teachers' meetings	28%	27%	14%
Resource or visiting teacher	11%	12%	41%
Conversations with other teachers	37%	28%	7%
Other	7%	2%	4%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources (Continued):

TABLE 39 - Wisconsin

(Question 24)

Amount of use made of institutional sources of information	Wisconsin			
	Never heard of or used		Used occasionally or often	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Local instructional materials center	118	40%	176	60%
University facilities	145	49%	151	51%
SEIMC or IMCSE	195	65%	105	35%
ERIC (Education & Resources Information Center)	269	88%	35	12%
Regional Labs	271	91%	26	9%

TABLE 39 - California

(Question 24)

Amount of use made of institutional sources of information	California			
	Never heard of or used		Used occasionally or often	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Local instructional materials center	96	36%	168	64%
University facilities	103	39%	159	61%
SEIMC or IMCSE	105	40%	158	60%
ERIC (Education & Resources Information Center)	226	86%	37	14%
Regional labs	224	87%	33	13%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources (Continued):

TABLE 40 - Wisconsin

(Question 25)

Extent to which local resources (school, county library, etc.) meet respondent's needs for instructional materials	Wisconsin			
	Satisfactory		Not available or unsatisfactory	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Textbooks/workbooks	218	70%	93	30%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	153	50%	154	50%
Programmed instructional materials	103	34%	202	66%
Audio-visual equipment	248	80%	62	20%
Audio-visual aids	229	74%	79	26%
Educational TV, video tapes, etc.	72	25%	219	75%

TABLE 40 - California

(Question 25)

Extent to which local resources (School, county library, etc.) meet respondent's needs for instructional materials	California			
	Satisfactory		Not available or unsatisfactory	
	N	Percent	N	Percent
Textbooks/workbooks	152	58%	108	42%
Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.	128	48%	136	52%
Programmed instructional materials	73	28%	186	72%
Audio-visual equipment	199	76%	63	24%
Audio-visual aids	166	64%	94	36%
Educational TV, video tapes, etc.	77	31%	173	69%

Evaluation of Materials and Resources (Continued):

TABLE 41

(Question 19)

Services which would be most beneficial to Special Education Teachers	Wisconsin		California	
	% of first choices	% of second choices	% of first choices	% of second choices
Better evaluation of materials	17%	13%	16%	19%
More materials demonstrations	22%	28%	21%	19%
Improved teacher-training methods	8%	12%	16%	15%
Better orientation to location of materials	14%	18%	15%	18%
Improved facilities for borrowing equipment	11%	16%	13%	11%
More seminars or workshops on Special Education problems	28%	13%	19%	17%

APPENDIX C

Survey Techniques

APPENDIX C

The Mailing Package

Underlying the design of the total mailing package was the assumption that it should be attractive enough to generate sufficient initial interest to open it, and then have enough internal appeal to motivate completion. For these reasons, the following basic approaches were used in package design:

A. The questionnaire itself was Varityped rather than merely using standard typewriter. Use of Varitype permitted interesting variations in type boldness, style, and size.

B. Use of colored papers and inks tends to attract more attention than the use of black ink on white paper. The mailing and return envelopes incorporated interesting designs with the use of common colored inks. The questionnaire itself was printed on a beige paper in the same ink as the envelopes, thereby creating a color coordination throughout the whole package.

C. The use of interesting, colorful commemorative stamps seems to increase initial interest in responding. Several stamps were selected for use on both the mailing and returns which tended to blend with the ink colors used on other pieces.

D. A specially designed Digitek answer form was used for the mail survey. This form was, insofar as possible, color coordinated with the remainder of the package. Use of an optical scanning form permitted rapid turnaround of data transfer and computer output.

E. Personal signatures rather than machine produced signatures seem to be more attractive to respondents. All AIR cover letters to the respondents were printed on AIR bond letterhead and all were personally signed.

Variables in the Mailing Package

Several experimental variables were introduced into the mailing. Some of these were a result of timing and not necessarily direct planning. For example, the California mailing list arrived on computer labels on the day scheduled for mailing, so it was not possible to retype the names and addresses directly on the envelopes. The following lists the various factors which were modified for different mailing groups:

A. Location of mailing address: Practically all Wisconsin addresses represented school addresses, while practically all California addresses were home addresses. In both cases the lists were approximately one year old and did not reflect the normal turnover in addresses.

B. The Political Situation: There seems to be a stronger or more meaningful interrelationship between teachers and the state Department of Special Education in Wisconsin than in California. In California the local systems assume a greater autonomy, so requests by the state may have had less impact than in Wisconsin.

C. Application of Addresses: All Wisconsin mailings were personally addressed, as was the AIR cover letter which was inserted. The California mailings were addressed with computer labels and the cover letter read "Dear Teacher of Special Education."

D. Cover Letters: All Wisconsin subjects received an AIR cover letter which explained the mechanics of questionnaire completion and an additional cover letter from John Melcher, Director of the Bureau for Handicapped Children. The California mailing was split between use of an AIR cover letter only (791) and the use of a letter to AIR endorsing the objectives of the study signed by Donald Mahler, Chief of Bureau of Educationally Handicapped and Mentally Exceptional Children (276). The endorsement letter arrived too late for its inclusion in the total mailing.

E. Postage Return: A small subsample of subjects was selected to receive a Digitek answer sheet with a postal permit printed directly on the sheet. If such an approach were proven effective in terms of return rate and condition of the returned answer sheet, considerable savings in postage and in elimination of return envelopes would result.

Results of the Mailing

A single mailing was decided upon as a result of the close timing between mailing and data analysis and also due to the fact that reminders are usually not too effective in stimulating additional returns. The cost of reminders usually does not warrant the small number of additional returns stimulated by them.

A summary of results in the mailing are found in Table 3 (Appendix A). While it is extremely difficult to isolate individual factors to attribute difference in return rates between the two states, some inferences can be made which could have implications for future mailings:

A. The more personalized mailing seems to draw a greater response rate (45.6% in Wisconsin vs. 25.7% in California) than a generalized mailing. This suggests that wherein possible, the mailing envelope and the cover letters should be personally typed rather than making use of labeled addresses and general greetings.

B. The relationship between the State Educational group and the communities within the service area should be examined to determine whether promotional letters from the state are likely to have a positive or a negative effect on responses. In California, for example, where the relations are not always too close, there was an approximately 8% (27.7% vs. 19.9%) better return from subjects who did not receive any state cover letter. The tone or "approach" of a cover letter might also be a factor which encourages or discourages response.

C. On an overall basis there does not seem to be a great difference between use of a permit return answer sheet and a stamped return envelope (30.9% with permit vs. 33.6% with return envelope). If the permit return rate can be assumed equal to the return envelope rate, then postage and printing costs can be significantly reduced in large mailings.

D. Use of school addresses seems more effective than home mailings. This could be attributed to a sense of greater pressure to complete the form if it is received in the school environment than if it is received at home.

E. Use of an Optical Scanning answer sheet seems to be effective for processing purposes in terms of turnaround time once the data was fully edited and coded. The 14.6% "completion problems" from teachers did force a great deal of form editing which would have been required in any case prior to manual keypunching. Once processed, it required about one hour to produce 1176 verified cards for computer input.

Suggestions for Future Evaluations

The combination of mail and personal follow-ups seems to be effective in gathering information relevant to the defined objectives. Limitations imposed by financial considerations suggest that a total personal interview approach would be too costly in relation to the amount of information gathered. Therefore, the combination of mail-personal seems to be the most economical in terms of gathering data from large numbers of subjects. In fact, the mail approach alone seems to produce effective results.

There was little difference in the content between those interviews conducted by phone and in person. This suggests that a total phone follow-up be used in future evaluations. The telephone costs incurred in coverage of a large geographic area can in certain cases be reduced through the use of Wide Area Telephone Service (WATS) and intelligent scheduling. For example, if one central point is selected from which phone interviewing can be conducted, almost full use can be made of WATS lines if Eastern calls are made before those in the West. Another alternative would be to establish regional centers from which telephone operations could be conducted. Use of one central location does have the added advantage of providing almost complete control over the interviewing process.

Future evaluations should make full use of the factors which seem to increase return rates. The complete package should be attractively designed in every sense possible, e. g., color, type styles, papers, etc. Wherever possible, the mailings should be personalized to help increase motivation to open and complete the form. Careful attention should be paid to any characteristics of the local educational situation which could effect return rates. For example, if the State Department of Education does not have a close tie with local teachers, use of state cover letters should probably be avoided. Wherein possible, the nature and age of the mailing list used should be given careful attention. A list which is a year old represents addresses which have a fairly large error factor. Mailings should be timed so as to take advantage of the latest list modifications. School addresses seem to be preferable to home addresses if such listings are available.

APPENDIX D

Samples of Survey Booklets and Cover Letters

OCT 67/AIR

SURVEY OF MATERIALS INFORMATION NEEDS
SURVEY BOOKLET

INSTRUCTIONS: All questions are to be answered on the answer sheet IN PENCIL ONLY. If you erase an answer, do so completely.

FIRST complete the identification information requested at the top of the answer sheet. You may be contacted for some additional information.

SECOND answer each numbered question and sub-part on the answer sheet. Questions 14 and 15 are to be written. All other answers require a single mark. While some questions require only one response, others ask that you rank or rate a series of items under the main question. BE SURE TO USE BOTH SIDES OF THE ANSWER SHEET. If one of the answer categories provided does not cover your response, mark the "Other" category on the answer sheet and specify your response on the attached sheet provided for this purpose.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. At the present time in which one of these areas do you teach the most?

A. Trainable Mentally Retarded
(*IQ lower than 50*)
B. Educable Mentally Retarded
(*IQ over 50*)
C. Both EMR and TMR
D. Slow Learner
E. Physically Handicapped
F. Speech/Deaf/Blind
G. Emotionally Disturbed
H. Specific Learning Disability
I. Other (*Specify on attached sheet*)

2. What is the age level of the children with whom you work?

A. Under 7
B. 7-10
C. 11-13
D. 14-16
E. Over 16
F. Other (*Specify on attached sheet*)

3. Number of years of full-time teaching?

A. 0-1
B. 2-4
C. 5-8
D. 9-15
E. 16 or more

4. Number of years of teaching Special Education subjects?

A. 0-1
B. 2
C. 3
D. 4
E. 5 or more

5. Number of years of teaching in the state in which you presently teach?

A. This is first year
B. Starting second year
C. Two years
D. Three years or more

6. Amount of training in Special Education?

A. Certified in Special Education, with extra coursework beyond certification
B. Certified in Special Education
C. Working toward certification
D. Not working toward certification, but have taken one or more courses in Special Education
E. No Special Education training

INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL SYSTEM

7. Approximately how many teachers of Special Education are there in your county or school district?

A. 20 or less
B. 21-40
C. 41-60
D. 61-100
E. Over 100

8. Compared with regular education classes, how strongly do you feel that your county or school district administration supports the Special Education program?

A. Stronger support than regular education
B. Equal to regular education
C. Weaker support than regular education

9. Compared to regular education classes, how strongly do you feel that your school principal supports the Special Education program?

A. Stronger support than regular education
B. Equal to regular education
C. Weaker support than regular education

10. Do you feel that your school budget allows you to purchase most of the regular classroom materials you need?

A. Over 90% of what I need
B. 80-90% of what I need
C. 60-80% of what I need
D. Less than 50% of what I need

11. Do you feel that your school budget allows you to purchase most of the supplementary materials you need?

A. Over 90% of what I need
B. 80-90% of what I need
C. 60-80% of what I need
D. Less than 50% of what I need

12. Which one of the following statements best describes the organization under which you teach Special Education classes?

A. Assigned to one school and teach there
B. Assigned to one school and teach at several schools
C. Assigned to several schools
D. Work from central office and serve a network of schools
E. Other (*Specify on attached sheet*)

13. How many classes for handicapped children are taught in the school where you principally teach?

A. One
B. 2-5
C. 6 or more
D. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

EVALUATION OF PRESENT MATERIALS

14. Of the materials you presently have available for use in your classroom, what do you use most often? List on the answer sheet beside "1st" that material you use most often. List beside "2nd" that material you use second most often, etc. Please identify series or product by commercially known title.

15. Irrespective of the amount of use, list the materials you presently find to be the most effective in teaching Special Education. List on the answer sheet beside "1st" that material you find most effective. List beside "2nd" that material you find second most effective, etc. Please identify series or product by commercially known title.

16. Do you consider that you have the best materials available for use in your classes? Rate each item below using the following code:

1 = Not Available
2 = Inadequate
3 = Adequate
4 = Best

A. Textbooks/workbooks
B. Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.
C. Programmed instruction materials
D. Audio-visual equipment
E. Films, filmstrips, etc.
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

17. In which subject areas do you find the greatest need for improvement in instructional materials? Rank each area below by marking the "1" next to the area which you feel has the greatest need for improvement, Mark the "2" next to the area which you feel has the second greatest need for improvement.

A. Reading
B. Arithmetic
C. Science
D. Social Studies
E. Home Economics or Industrial Skills
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

18. In the field of Special Education, what types of curriculum materials do you feel there is the greatest need for improvement? Rank each area below by marking the "1" next to the area which you feel has the greatest need for improvement. Mark the "2" next to the area which you feel has the second greatest need for improvement.

A. Textbooks/workbooks
B. Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.
C. Programmed instruction materials
D. Audio-visual equipment
E. Educational TV, video tapes, etc.
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

19. As a teacher in Special Education, which of the following factors do you feel will be the most beneficial to you? Rank each area below by marking the "1" next to the area which you feel will be the most beneficial. Mark the "2" next to the area which you feel will be the second most beneficial.

A. Better evaluation of material
B. More materials demonstration
C. Improved teacher-training methods
D. Better orientation to location of materials
E. Improved facilities for borrowing equipment
F. More seminars or workshops on special education problems

20. Rank the following sources of information about Special Educational materials in terms of importance to you as a teacher. Mark the "1" next to the area which is most important, etc. *(Use "X" if not available to you.*

A. Displays at district or state conventions
B. Local workshops and demonstrations
C. Publishers' catalogues
D. Journals, newsletters, etc.
E. "Winnower" *(in Wisconsin)* or "5 x 8" or "Communicator" *(in California)*
F. In-service training programs

21. What is the method of approval for Special Education materials in your school system?

A. Teachers evaluation committee
B. Administrative evaluation
C. State approval list
D. No formal approval list
E. Don't know
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

22. Are your purchases of Special Education materials restricted to an approved list?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Don't know

23. Rank the following sources of information about Special Education materials in terms of importance to you as a teacher. Mark the "1" next to the most important, the "2" next to the second most important, etc. *(Use "X" if not available to you.)*

A. Talks at district or state conventions
B. Talks at local faculty meetings
C. Talks at Special Education Teachers meetings
D. Resource or visiting teacher
E. Conversations with other teachers
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

24. Rate the amount of use you have made of each of the following sources of information. Use the following code:

1 = Never Heard of
2 = Never Used
3 = Used Occasionally
4 = Used Often

A. ERIC *(Educational Resources Information Center)*
B. Regional Labs
C. Local Instructional Materials Center
D. SEIMC *(in Wisconsin)* or IMCSE *(in California)*
E. University facilities
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

25. Rate to what extent your school resources *(school or county library, etc.)* meet your needs for instructional materials. Use the following code to rate each item:

1 = Not Available
2 = Unsatisfactory
3 = Generally Satisfactory
4 = Very Satisfactory

A. Textbooks/workbooks
B. Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.
C. Programmed instruction materials
D. Audio-visual equipment
E. Audio-visual aids
F. Educational TV, video tapes, etc.

TURN TO SECOND SIDE OF ANSWER SHEET

NOTE: The following questions refer to the Special Education Instructional Materials Center located at the University of Southern California (IMCSE).

26. In general, how well acquainted do you consider yourself with the purposes and programs of the IMCSE?

A. Never heard of
B. Know very little about
C. Know something about
D. Know a great deal about

27. How did you hear about the IMCSE?

A. Other teachers
B. Supervisors or Director
C. Representative from IMCSE
D. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

28. Have you ever visited the IMCSE Library?

A. No
B. Visited once
C. Visited one or more times and used services

29. If you have not used Library resources, what is main reason? *(Mark One)*

A. Not applicable
B. Don't know enough about
C. Other groups do as well in providing materials
D. Not enough time to incorporate ICMSE into my schedule
E. Too far away to use effectively
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

NOTE: In addition to the Library operation IMCSE sponsors several other services. Even if you are not familiar with the name IMCSE, you may have used some of the following services.

30. How valuable have you found the publication, "5 x 8"?

A. Never received it
B. Have found it to be of general interest only
C. Have found it to be of some value to me in my teaching
D. Find it to be very valuable and have applied several ideas in my classroom

31. How valuable have you found the "Communicator"?

A. Never received it
B. Have found it to be of general interest only
C. Have found it to be of some value to me in my teaching
D. Find it to be very valuable and have applied several ideas in my classroom

32. Have you ever attended a SEE conference?

A. Never heard of it
B. Heard of them, never attended
C. Attended one conference, found it to be of general interest
D. Attended one conference, found it to be of considerable value
E. Attended more than one conference

33. Have you seen a materials display exhibit sponsored by IMCSE?

A. No
B. Yes, found it of some general interest
C. Yes, found it to be valuable

34. Have you ever requested a bibliography search from IMCSE?

A. No
B. Yes, Once
C. Yes, More Than Once

35. Have you ever attended a conference at IMCSE at the University of Southern California?

A. Never heard of them
B. Heard of them, but have never attended
C. Yes, considered them to be of little value
D. Yes, found them to be of value to me as a teacher
E. Yes, found them to be very valuable to me as a teacher

36. Have you ever seen a field demonstration of materials by IMCSE?

A. Never heard of them
B. Heard of them, but have never seen one
C. Yes, considered them to be of little value
D. Yes, found them to be of value
E. Yes, found them to be of considerable value to me as a teacher

37. What effect, if any, do you feel that the IMCSE has had on Special Education in your county?

A. No opinion
B. Overall negative effect
C. No positive effect
D. Little positive effect
E. Some positive effect
F. A great deal of positive effect

38. The IMCSE can serve various functions for a Special Education teacher. Rank the degree of importance to you of each of the functions listed below. Mark the "1" next to the area which you feel is most important, the "2" next to the area which you feel is second most important, etc.

A. Library services
B. Information retrieval systems
C. Evaluation of materials
D. Demonstration of materials
E. Workshops and in-service training
F. Stimulation of the production of new materials

39. Below is a list of various actions that could be taken to improve the service and effectiveness of an instructional Materials Center. For each action listed, rank the degree of improvement in terms of service and effectiveness if the following actions were taken:

A. Orientation or location and availability of materials
B. More seminars and workshops
C. More frequent mailings of available materials
D. Video tapes of seminars
E. More varied selection of materials
F. More exhibitions of materials at local schools
G. Faster return of inquiries
H. Method of borrowing equipment

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

OCT 67/AIR

SURVEY OF MATERIALS INFORMATION NEEDS SURVEY BOOKLET

INSTRUCTIONS: All questions are to be answered on the answer sheet IN PENCIL ONLY. If you erase an answer, do so completely.

FIRST complete the identification information requested at the top of the answer sheet. You may be contacted for some additional information.

SECOND answer each numbered question and subpart on the answer sheet. Questions 14 and 15 are to be written. All other answers require a single mark. While some questions require only one response, others ask that you rank or rate a series of items under the main question. BE SURE TO USE BOTH SIDES OF THE ANSWER SHEET. If one of the answer categories provided does not cover your response, mark the "Other" category on the answer sheet and specify your response on the attached sheet provided for this purpose.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION

1. At the present time in which one of these areas do you teach the most?

   A. Trainable Mentally Retarded *(IQ lower than 50)*
   B. Educable Mentally Retarded *(IQ over 50)*
   C. Both EMR and TMR
   D. Slow Learner
   E. Physically Handicapped
   F. Speech/Deaf/Blind
   G. Emotionally Disturbed
   H. Specific Learning Disability
   I. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

2. What is the age level of the children with whom you work?

   A. Under 7
   B. 7-10
   C. 11-13
   D. 14-16
   E. Over 16
   F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

3. Number of years of full-time teaching?

   A. 0-1
   B. 2-4
   C. 5-8
   D. 9-15
   E. 16 or more

4. Number of years of teaching Special Education subjects?

   A. 0-1
   B. 2
   C. 3
   D. 4
   E. 5 or more

5. Number of years of teaching in the state in which you presently teach?

   A. This is first year
   B. Starting second year
   C. Two years
   D. Three years or more

6. Amount of training in Special Education?

   A. Certified in Special Education, with extra coursework beyond certification
   B. Certified in Special Education
   C. Working toward certification
   D. Not working toward certification, but have taken one or more courses in Special Education
   E. No Special Education training

INFORMATION ABOUT SCHOOL SYSTEM

7. Approximately how many teachers of Special Education are there in your county or school district?

   A. 20 or less
   B. 21-40
   C. 41-60
   D. 61-100
   E. Over 100

8. Compared with regular education classes, how strongly do you feel that your county or school district administration supports the Special Education program?

   A. Stronger support than regular education
   B. Equal to regular education
   C. Weaker support than regular education

9. Compared to regular education classes, how strongly do you feel that your school principal supports the Special Education program?

   A. Stronger support than regular education
   B. Equal to regular education
   C. Weaker support than regular education

10. Do you feel that your school budget allows you to purchase most of the regular classroom materials you need?

    A. Over 90% of what I need
    B. 80-90% of what I need
    C. 60-80% of what I need
    D. Less than 50% of what I need

11. Do you feel that your school budget allows you to purchase most of the supplementary materials you need?

    A. Over 90% of what I need
    B. 80-90% of what I need
    C. 60-80% of what I need
    D. Less than 50% of what I need

12. Which one of the following statements best describes the organization under which you teach Special Education classes?

    A. Assigned to one school and teach there
    B. Assigned to one school and teach at several schools
    C. Assigned to several schools
    D. Work from central office and serve a network of schools
    E. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

13. How many classes for handicapped children are taught in the school where you principally teach?

A. One
B. 2-5
C. 6 or more
D. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

EVALUATION OF PRESENT MATERIALS

14. Of the materials you presently have available for use in your classroom, what do you use most often? List on the answer sheet beside "1st" that material you use most often. List beside "2nd" that material you use second most often, etc. Please identify series or product by commercially known title.

15. Irrespective of the amount of use, list the materials you presently find to be the most effective in teaching Special Education. List on the answer sheet beside "1st" that material you find most effective. List beside "2nd" that material you find second most effective, etc. Please identify series or product by commercially known title.

16. Do you consider that you have the best materials available for use in your classes? Rate each item below using the following code:

1 = Not Available
2 = Inadequate
3 = Adequate
4 = Best

A. Textbooks/workbooks
B. Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.
C. Programmed instruction materials
D. Audio-visual equipment
E. Films, filmstrips, etc.
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

17. In which subject areas do you find the greatest need for improvement in instructional materials? Rank each area below by marking the "1" next to the area which you feel has the greatest need for improvement, Mark the "2" next to the area which you feel has the second greatest need for improvement.

A. Reading
B. Arithmetic
C. Science
D. Social Studies
E. Home Economics or Industrial Skills
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

18. In the field of Special Education, what types of curriculum materials do you feel there is the greatest need for improvement? Rank each area below by marking the "1" next to the area which you feel has the greatest need for improvement. Mark the "2" next to the area which you feel has the second greatest need for improvement.

A. Textbooks/workbooks
B. Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.
C. Programmed instruction materials
D. Audio-visual equipment
E. Educational TV, video tapes, etc.
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

19. As a teacher in Special Education, which of the following factors do you feel will be the most beneficial to you? Rank each area below by marking the "1" next to the area which you feel will be the most beneficial. Mark the "2" next to the area which you feel will be the second most beneficial.

A. Better evaluation of material
B. More materials demonstration
C. Improved teacher-training methods
D. Better orientation to location of materials
E. Improved facilities for borrowing equipment
F. More seminars or workshops on special education problems

20. Rank the following sources of information about Special Educational materials in terms of importance to you as a teacher. Mark the "1" next to the area which is most important, etc. *(Use "X" if not available to you.*

A. Displays at district or state conventions
B. Local workshops and demonstrations
C. Publishers' catalogues
D. Journals, newsletters, etc.
E. "Winnower" *(in Wisconsin)* or "5 x 8" or "Communicator" *(in California)*
F. In-service training programs

21. What is the method of approval for Special Education materials in your school system?

A. Teachers evaluation committee
B. Administrative evaluation
C. State approval list
D. No formal approval list
E. Don't know
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

22. Are your purchases of Special Education materials restricted to an approved list?

A. Yes
B. No
C. Don't know

23. Rank the following sources of information about Special Education materials in terms of importance to you as a teacher. Mark the "1" next to the most important, the "2" next to the second most important, etc. *(Use "X" if not available to you.)*

A. Talks at district or state conventions
B. Talks at local faculty meetings
C. Talks at Special Education Teachers meetings
D. Resource or visiting teacher
E. Conversations with other teachers
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

24. Rate the amount of use you have made of each of the following sources of information. Use the following code:

1 = Never Heard of
2 = Never Used
3 = Used Occasionally
4 = Used Often

A. ERIC *(Educational Resources Information Center)*
B. Regional Labs
C. Local Instructional Materials Center
D. SEIMC *(in Wisconsin)* or IMCSE *(in California)*
E. University facilities
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

25. Rate to what extent your school resources *(school or county library, etc.)* meet your needs for instructional materials. Use the following code to rate each item:

1 = Not Available
2 = Unsatisfactory
3 = Generally Satisfactory
4 = Very Satisfactory

A. Textbooks/workbooks
B. Manipulative materials, ready-made kits, games, etc.
C. Programmed instruction materials
D. Audio-visual equipment
E. Audio-visual aids
F. Educational TV, video tapes, etc.

TURN TO SECOND SIDE OF ANSWER SHEET

NOTE: The following questions refer to the Special Education Instructional Materials Center, located at the University of Wisconsin (SEIMC)

26. In general, how well acquainted do you consider yourself with the purposes and programs of the SEIMC?

A. Never heard of it
B. Know very little about it
C. Know something about it
D. Know a great deal about it

27. How did you hear about the SEIMC?

A. Other teachers
B. Supervisors or Director
C. Representative from SEIMC
D. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

28. Have you ever visited the SEIMC Library?

A. No
B. Visited once
C. Visited one or more times and used services

29. If you have not used Library resources, what is main reason?

A. Not applicable
B. Don't know enough about it
C. Other groups do as well in providing materials
D. Not enough time to incorporate SEIMC into my schedule
E. Too far away to use effectively
F. Other *(Specify on attached sheet)*

NOTE: In addition to the Library operation SEIMC sponsors several other services. Even if you are not familiar with the name SEIMC, you may have used some of the following services:

30. How valuable have you found the publication, "The Winnower"?

A. Never received it
B. Have found it to be of general interest only
C. Have found it to be of some value to me in my teaching
D. Find it to be very valuable and have applied several ideas in my classroom

31. Which one of the following have you found most valuable in the Winnower?

A. Articles
B. Materials Evaluation
C. Research Reviews
D. Acquisition List

32. Have you ever attended an in-service Training Conference?

A. Never heard of it
B. Heard of them, never attended
C. Attended one conference, found it to be of general interest
D. Attended one conference, found it to be of considerable value
E. Attended more than one conference

33. Have you seen a materials display exhibit sponsored by SEIMC?

A. No
B. Yes, found it of some general interest
C. Yes, found it to be valuable

34. Have you ever requested a bibliography search from SEIMC?

A. No
B. Yes, Once
C. Yes, More Than Once

35. Have you ever attended a workshop or institute at SEIMC at the University of Wisconsin?

A. Never heard of them
B. Heard of them, but never have attended
C. Yes, considered them to be of little value
D. Yes, found them to be of value to me as a teacher
E. Yes, found them to be very valuable to me as a teacher

36. Have you ever seen a field demonstration of materials by SEIMC?

A. Never heard of them
B. Heard of them, but have never seen one
C. Yes, considered them to be of little value
D. Yes, found them to be of value
E. Yes, found them to be of considerable value to me as a teacher

37. What effect, if any, do you feel that the SEIMC has had on Special Education in your county?

A. No opinion
B. Overall negative effect
C. No positive effect
D. Little positive effect
E. Some positive effect
F. A great deal of positive effect

38. The SEIMC can serve various functions for a Special Education teacher. Rate the degree of importance to you of each of the functions listed below, Mark the "1" next to the area which you feel is most important, the "2" next to the area which you feel is second most important, etc.

A. Library services
B. Information retrieval systems
C. Evaluation of materials
D. Demonstration of materials
E. Workshops and in-service training
F. Stimulation of the production of new materials

39. Below is a list of various actions that could be taken to improve the service and effectiveness of an Instructional Materials Center. For each action listed, rank the degree of improvement in terms of service and effectiveness if the following actions were taken:

A. Orientation or location and availability of materials
B. More seminars and workshops
C. More frequent mailings of available materials
D. Video tapes of seminars
E. More varied selection of materials
F. More exhibitions of materials at local schools
G. Faster return of inquiries
H. Method of borrowing equipment

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION

AIR COVER LETTER - WISCONSIN - RETURN ENVELOPE

AIR AMERICAN INSTITUTES FOR RESEARCH
135 NORTH BELLEFIELD AVENUE
PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA 15213

The American Institutes for Research has been awarded a contract by the United States Office of Education to conduct a Pilot Evaluation of Instructional Materials Centers for the Handicapped. An effective evaluation of Instructional Materials Centers is dependent on your cooperation. If you would take a few minutes of your time to answer the enclosed questionnaire, we will be able to make a valid and reliable reading of user, e.g., special education teachers' reactions to past, present and future activities of IMC's.

You will notice that there is a separate questionnaire and a separate answer sheet. In addition there is a smaller slip of paper on which you are to record additional comments and more specific responses to certain questions with an "Other" category. All answers should be recorded only on the answer sheet and on the extra slip of paper, and only these items should be returned to AIR. In marking your answers USE A PENCIL ONLY. When folding your answer sheet for mailing, BE SURE TO FOLD ONLY ON THE LINES INDICATED. A stamped, return envelope is enclosed for return of the answer sheet and the extra slip of paper.

While all the information you provide us will be treated as strictly confidential, we do ask for your name, school, address, etc. A smaller group of teachers will be selected to be asked some more detailed information either through a short personal visit to the school or through a telephone interview at home. This personal interviewing will help to add more depth to the data provided on the enclosed form. If at all possible, this personal interview will be conducted during one of your free periods in school and should not take over 20 minutes.

We thank you for your help on this very important project.

Sincerely,

John R. Fetter

John R. Fetter
Survey Specialist

JRF:cd

Enc.

TELEPHONE: (412) 683-7600 • CABLE: AIRESEARCH

WISCONSIN STATE COVER LETTER

The State of Wisconsin
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC INSTRUCTION
Wisconsin Hall
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

WILLIAM C. KAHL
STATE SUPERINTENDENT
ARCHIE A. BUCHMILLER
DEPUTY STATE SUPERINTENDENT

JOHN W. MELCHER, DIRECTOR
ASSISTANT SUPERINTENDENT

Bureau for Handicapped Children

Dear Special Education Teacher:

The volume of instructional materials available to teachers is great and increases daily. The quality and complexity of such materials vary. Some items become outdated and the opportunity is not generally available for teachers to spend the time needed in order to be current on the availability of quality materials.

In 1964 the Research Branch of the Handicapped Children and Youth Division of the U. S. Office of Education funded two pilot Special Education Instructional Materials Centers, one at the University of Wisconsin and the other at the University of Southern California. Broad objectives of these pilot centers were and will be to (a) service teachers with materials information, (b) research materials, and (c) stimulate production of materials.

The American Institutes for Research has recently been awarded a contract by the Office of Education to make a study of the effectiveness of these initial efforts and to provide recommendations to the Office of Education on needed improvements.

One of the most important dimensions of this evaluative process is the actual user population, e.g., you, the special education teacher. The enclosed mail survey is being conducted in the State of Wisconsin to determine past, present, and future needs of special education teachers. Additionally, a smaller group of teachers will be interviewed personally, either by telephone or in person, to add some depth to the questions asked.

I personally wish to ask your cooperation with AIR in completing the enclosed questionnaire, and, if called upon, to help with any additional questions they may wish to ask. The few minutes you spend will help to provide more effective service to you and to other special education teachers around the country.

Sincerely yours,

BUREAU FOR HANDICAPPED CHILDREN

By John W. Melcher
Director

John W. Melcher
Asst. State Supt.
rhj

Enc.

OE 6000 (REV. 9-66)

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

ERIC REPORT RESUME

ERIC ACCESSION NO.

CLEARINGHOUSE ACCESSION NUMBER

RESUME DATE	P.A.	T.A.
01 ‾31‾ 68		

IS DOCUMENT COPYRIGHTED? YES ☐ NO ☒
ERIC REPRODUCTION RELEASE? YES ☒ NO ☐

TITLE
A PILOT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIAL CENTERS:
Instructional Materials Center Network for Handicapped Children and Youth
(Final Report)

PERSONAL AUTHOR(S)
Williams, Charles F. and Johnson, George H.

INSTITUTION (SOURCE)
American Institutes for Research, Washington, D.C. Office

SOURCE CODE

REPORT/SERIES NO. AIR-F-87-[illegible]/68-FR-2

OTHER SOURCE ---

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO. ---

OTHER SOURCE ---

SOURCE CODE

OTHER REPORT NO. ---

PUB'L. DATE 01 – 31 – 68 XXXXXXXX/GRANT NUMBER OEG 2-7-070438-3027

PAGINATION, ETC.
135 p.

RETRIEVAL TERMS
Special Education
Special Education Instructional Materials
Special Education Personnel, Needs and Practices of
Instructional Materials Centers
Survey Research

IDENTIFIERS
Instructional Materials Center Network for Handicapped Children and Youth (IMCNHCY)

ABSTRACT

This report describes a nine-month pilot evaluation of the developing Special Education Instructional Materials Center Network. Two approaches were used: 1) a process evaluation, in which the evaluation team made site visits to determine the status of activities at the two prototype Special Education Instructional Materials Centers at the University of Wisconsin and the University of Southern California, and 2) a user survey, which utilized 588 mail questionnaires, follow-up interviews with 175 teachers, and interviews with 44 administrators to collect information on the current needs and practices of Special Education personnel in California and Wisconsin and to measure the impact of the SEIMC services upon the field.

The SEIMCs have been highly successful in their basic mission of establishing themselves as field-oriented change agents in Special Education. Detailed results of site visits are reported in terms of SEIMC service functions (library, publications, field services), research and evaluation activities, and efforts to stimulate production of new instructional materials. Field survey results cover teacher evaluation of materials now in use, adequacy of local materials resources, current sources of information about instructional materials, and teacher knowledge and use of SEIMC services.